

H. R. 5512. A bill to amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 5513. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5514. A bill to amend section 2000 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to taxes on tobacco and tobacco products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5515. A bill to amend section 2000 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to taxes on tobacco and tobacco products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 5516. A bill amending Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H. J. Res. 289. Joint resolution to provide emergency relief for victims of the flash floods which occurred on June 17 and 18, 1949, in the Commonwealth of Virginia, and for the restoration and reconstruction of the devastated areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. J. Res. 290. Joint resolution to provide emergency relief for victims of the flash floods which occurred on June 17 and 18, 1949, in Grant, Hardy, Pendleton, and Tucker Counties, W. Va., and for the restoration and reconstruction of the devastated areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. J. Res. 291. Joint resolution to appoint a board of engineers to examine and report upon the proposed central Arizona project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 292. Joint resolution to appoint a board of engineers to examine and report upon the proposed central Arizona project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. J. Res. 293. Joint resolution to appoint a board of engineers to examine and report upon the proposed central Arizona project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. Con. Res. 99. Concurrent resolution providing that Congress shall meet on November 1, 1949, to eliminate unnecessary governmental functions and to bring the expenditures of the Federal Government into balance with its income; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution to maintain permanent peace and prevent war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 5517. A bill for the relief of Lt. Ralph E. Hazen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 5518. A bill for the relief of Gustav, Dora, and Manfred Lobl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COX:

H. R. 5519. A bill for the relief of James Sech-chau Hwong and Mrs. Tseng-hwa Chow Hwong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 5520. A bill for the relief of Mario Bosco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5521. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Cuccurullo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON (by request):

H. R. 5522. A bill for the relief of Joaquim B. Calca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAYBURN:

H. R. 5523. A bill for the relief of Fred I. Massengill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 5524. A bill for the relief of William Sullivan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 5525. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Richard E. Deane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

THURSDAY, JULY 7, 1949

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 2, 1949)

The Senate met, in executive session, at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, Thou only art the fountain of our being, the light of all our seeing. Our puny mortal strength alone is unequal to the tests and tasks of these terrific times which are upon us. We dare not trust our own devices and councils. Give to those, we pray Thee, who through the treacherous seas of this violent time pilot the Nation's course, a revealing remembrance of the altars at which the founding fathers knelt, the ideals to which they were committed, the human rights to which they gave their fealty. For the radiant dream which we call America hear our vow as we too pledge our lives, fortunes, and sacred honor as security for freedom's greatest venture. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 6, 1949, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 70. An act to make effective in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska rules promulgated by the Supreme Court of the United States governing pleading, practice, and procedure in the district courts of the United States; and

S. 1042. An act relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent res-

olution (S. Con. Res. 23) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 242. An act to provide for the conferring of the degree of bachelor of science upon graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy;

H. R. 388. An act to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes;

H. R. 459. An act to authorize the payment of employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry for overtime duty performed at establishments which prepare virus, serum, toxin, or analogous products for use in the treatment of domestic animals;

H. R. 588. An act for the relief of Col. David R. Wolverton, United States Army, retired;

H. R. 734. An act for the relief of Curtis R. Enos;

H. R. 1028. An act to legalize the admission into the United States of Edmea Pachio;

H. R. 1038. An act for the relief of William Richard Geoffrey Malpas;

H. R. 1105. An act for the relief of Hazel L. Giles;

H. R. 1132. An act for the relief of Mabel H. Slocum;

H. R. 1354. An act to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California;

H. R. 1447. An act for the relief of Ethel Roth;

H. R. 1493. An act for the relief of Cecil L. Howell;

H. R. 1516. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, so as to provide annual automatic within-grade promotions for hourly employees of the custodial service;

H. R. 1679. An act for the relief of Mrs. Skio Takayama Hull;

H. R. 1726. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Hot Springs National Park, Ark., a perpetual easement for the construction and operation of a watermain pipe line;

H. R. 1861. An act for the relief of Elizabeth and Lawrence Wong;

H. R. 1864. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Mitsuo Higa, a minor, and Hilo Sugar Co.;

H. R. 1979. An act for the relief of Soo Hoo Yet Tuck;

H. R. 2091. An act for the relief of Jack McCollum;

H. R. 2239. An act for the relief of the estate of W. M. West;

H. R. 2344. An act for the relief of Charles W. Miles;

H. R. 2475. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell to Albert M. Lewis, Jr., certain land in the State of Florida;

H. R. 2517. An act directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to Palm Beach County, Fla.;

H. R. 2572. An act to extend to commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey the provisions of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946;

H. R. 2602. An act for the relief of John B. Boyle;

H. R. 2608. An act for the relief of C. H. Dutton Co., of Kalamazoo, Mich.;

H. R. 2678. An act to amend section 5 of the act approved July 10, 1890, as amended,

relating to the admission into the Union of the State of Wyoming, so as to permit the leasing of school lands within such State for mineral purposes for terms in excess of 10 years;

H. R. 2724. An act to provide a decree of competency for United States Indians in certain cases;

H. R. 2869. An act to authorize an appropriation in aid of a system of drainage and sanitation for the city of Polson, Mont.;

H. R. 2984. An act to consolidate the Parker Dam power project and the Davis Dam project;

H. R. 3285. An act authorizing the replacement and reconstruction by the Bureau of Reclamation of certain bridges across the Franklin canal of the Rio Grande project of the Bureau of Reclamation, within the city of El Paso, Tex., and authorizing appropriation for that purpose;

H. R. 3383. An act to provide that extra compensation for night work paid officers and employees of the United States shall be computed on the basis of either standard or daylight-saving time;

H. R. 3589. An act to convey to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, certain lands in Custer County, Mont., for use as an industrial site;

H. R. 3598. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katherine Gehring;

H. R. 3618. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Marcia Moss Carroll, a minor, and Charles P. Carroll;

H. R. 3667. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Lenora Farwell Fritzler;

H. R. 3718. An act for the relief of George Seeman Jensen;

H. R. 3768. An act for the relief of Mrs. Justa G. Vda. de Guido, Belen de Guido, Mullia de Guido, and Oscar de Guido;

H. R. 3816. An act for the relief of Alexis Leger;

H. R. 4073. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of New York of certain historic property situated within Fort Niagara State Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4208. An act to add certain surplus land to Petersburg National Military Park, Va., to define the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4306. An act for the relief of Zora B. Vullch;

H. R. 4353. An act to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens;

H. R. 4406. An act to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments;

H. R. 4510. An act to provide funds for co-operation with the school board of Klamath County, Oreg., for the construction, extension, and improvement of public-school facilities in Klamath County, Oreg., to be available to all Indian and non-Indian children without discrimination;

H. R. 4755. An act to authorize the appointment of an Advisory Committee on Indian Affairs;

H. R. 4829. An act to authorize the President to appoint Paul A. Smith as representative of the United States to the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization without affecting his status and perquisites as a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

H. R. 4854. An act for the relief of Mrs. Miriam G. Wornum;

H. R. 4875. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to travel expense allowances for Government employee witnesses;

H. R. 4943. An act to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Idaho into the Union by increasing the period for which leases may be made of public lands

granted to the State by such act for educational purposes;

H. R. 4948. An act relating to the policing of the building and grounds of the Supreme Court of the United States;

H. R. 5034. An act to authorize the taxation of Indian land holdings in the town of Lodge Grass, Mont., to assist in financing a municipal water supply and sewerage system;

H. R. 5170. An act to further the policy enunciated in the Historic Sites Act (49 Stat. 666) and to facilitate public participation in the preservation of sites, buildings, and objects of national significance or interest and providing a national trust for historic preservation;

H. R. 5205. An act to quitclaim certain property in Enid, Okla., to H. B. Bass;

H. R. 5237. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, section 90, to create a Swainsboro Division in the southern district of Georgia, with terms of court to be held at Swainsboro;

H. R. 5289. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the city and county of San Francisco;

H. R. 5299. An act for the relief of Mrs. Giovanna Follo Discepolo;

H. R. 5310. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of California over the lands and residents of the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation in said State, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5328. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the city and county of San Francisco; and

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution to provide for the coinage of a medal in recognition of the distinguished services of Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Murray
Anderson	Holland	Neely
Baldwin	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Ives	Pepper
Bricker	Jenner	Robertson
Bridges	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Butler	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Byrd	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cain	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Knowland	Sparkman
Chapman	Langer	Stennis
Chavez	Lodge	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McCarthy	Tobey
Downey	McClellan	Tydings
Eaton	McFarland	Vandenberg
Ferguson	McGrath	Watkins
Flanders	McKellar	Wherry
Fulbright	Malone	Wiley
Gillette	Martin	Williams
Green	Maybank	Withers
Gurney	Miller	Young
Hayden	Morse	
Hendrickson	Mundt	
Hill		

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed an adviser to the delegation of the United States of America to the Second World Health Organization Assembly meeting at Rome, Italy.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent on official business, presiding at a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in connection with an investigation of the affairs of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are in attendance at a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained because of attendance at a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By order of the Senate, the following announcement is made:

The members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy are in attendance at a meeting of the joint committee in connection with an investigation of the affairs of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Edward B. Lawson, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service Officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Iceland, and withdrawing a nomination, which nominating message was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably the nomination of Jefferson Caffery, of Louisiana, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Egypt. Mr. Caffery is well known to Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, also from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably the nomination of John Campbell Ausland, of Pennsylvania, and sundry other persons for appointment in the diplomatic service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be placed on the calendar.

The following favorable report was submitted:

By Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive E. Eighty-first Congress, first session, the convention on the international recognition of rights in aircraft, signed at Geneva on June 19, 1948 (Ex. Rept. No. 9).

#### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in legislative



session, Senators may be permitted to insert articles in the RECORD, and also introduce bills and submit petitions and memorials, without debate, as though we were in the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to be absent from the session of the Senate tomorrow.

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KILGORE a subcommittee of the Committee of the Judiciary was authorized to hold a hearing beginning at 2:30 o'clock this afternoon, on the subject of rain-making.

On request of Mr. LUCAS a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

##### SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. Doc. No. 98)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, amounting to \$3,500,000, Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1950 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

##### LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislative Assembly and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

##### PAYMENT OF ANNUAL LEAVE TO CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of August 8, 1946, relating to the payment of annual leave to certain officers and employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

##### INCREASE IN NUMBER OF EXAMINERS IN CHIEF, PATENT OFFICE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the number of examiners in chief in the Patent Office, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

##### REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Postmaster General, reporting, pursuant to law, on claims paid by that Department under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act, fiscal year 1948-49 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

##### DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

##### By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from the New York Board of Trade, Inc., of New York, N. Y., signed by Mortimer E. Sprague, president, praying for the enactment of legislation to repeal the Federal excise taxes on transportation; to the Committee on Finance.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association, of New York, N. Y., signed by Lo Koon Lai, president, relating to American relations with China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The petition of Mrs. Regina B. Hemmer, Buffalo, N. Y., relating to Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

##### RESOLUTIONS OF DISTRICT NO. 4, AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF WYOMING

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions received by me from the officials of district No. 4 of the American Legion, Department of Wyoming.

The resolutions pertain to espionage, treason, subversive activities against the United States Government, Yellowstone National Park, agriculture, and the development of reclamation in the West, the so-called valley authorities, national-health problems, development of the electric power by the Reclamation Service in the West, and veterans' pensions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, printed in the RECORD.

##### To the Committee on Appropriations:

"Whereas the basic prosperity of the West depends upon agriculture, and the development of agriculture in many large regions of the West can be accomplished only through reclamation; and

"Whereas the development of agriculture in the West through reclamation has been proven economically sound; and

"Whereas agriculture conducted upon reclaimed land where a sufficient supply of water is assured in drought as well as in wet years avoids the peril of drought, stabilizes production, and reduces human suffering; and

"Whereas the development of reclamation in the West greatly reduces the peril of floods in lower reaches of the rivers, whose toll of damage aggregates many times the cost of development of said reclamation; and

"Whereas the prosperity of the West, to a large extent dependent upon reclamation, is reflected in added prosperity in the balance of the Union; and

"Whereas a large number of land-hungry veterans still remain unsatisfied through the opening of previously constructed reclamation projects; and

"Whereas a considerable period of years is required for exploration, investigation, planning and preconstruction engineering before the construction of a reclamation project can even commence: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That district No. 4 of the American Legion, Department of Wyoming, in conference assembled at Basin, Wyo., this 15th day of May 1949, strongly urges the Congress of the United States of America to

appropriate sufficient moneys for the necessary exploration, investigation, planning, and preconstruction engineering of all possible regions where development through reclamation appears to be feasible; and be it further

"Resolved, That Congress be urged to consider reclamation not in the light of 'made work' to combat economic depressions, but as necessary to the orderly, economic development of the West, for which sufficient moneys should be appropriated for an orderly regular program of reclamation construction; and be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution be presented to the American Legion in department convention assembled with the recommendation that, if it is adopted, it be presented to the American Legion in national convention assembled; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, and to United States Senators Joseph C. O'Mahoney and Lester C. Hunt, Congressman Frank A. Barrett, to the Honorable J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, and Michael W. Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation.

"BRECK MORAN,

"Commander, District No. 4, the American Legion, Department of Wyoming.

"PAUL S. RUSSELL,

"Acting Adjutant."

##### To the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas a veterans' pension bill has been introduced in the Congress of the United States of America providing for the payment of pensions to all veterans attaining the age of 65, regardless of need; and

"Whereas we firmly believe that it is the privilege and duty of every American to support and defend his country at all times, and particularly in times of war, without thought of compensation other than the right to live in a free America; and

"Whereas the payment of such pensions would impose an unreasonable burden upon the people of the United States and result in confiscatory taxation for benefits to which veterans are not entitled; and

"Whereas we recognize that because of the immense pressure which can be exerted upon Congress in support of such a bill if it requires considerable political courage and statesmanship to oppose the same: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That district No. 4 of the American Legion, Department of Wyoming, in conference assembled this 15th day of May 1949, at Basin, Wyo., condemns the proposed pension bill recently introduced in Congress as unsound, unreasonable, and a political gesture threatening the very freedom for which so many of our comrades died; and be it further

"Resolved, That all Congressmen opposing said bill be commended for placing the welfare of this country ahead of personal political considerations; and be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution be presented to the American Legion in department convention assembled, with the recommendation that, if it is adopted, it be presented to the American Legion in national convention assembled; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, and to United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and LESTER C. HUNT, and to Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT.

"BRECK MORAN,

"Commander, District No. 4, the American Legion, Department of Wyoming.

"PAUL S. RUSSELL,

"Acting Adjutant."

##### To the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Whereas Yellowstone National Park belongs to the American public; and

"Whereas Yellowstone National Park, as presently operated, is generally open to the public only during the summer months; and

"Whereas those who have seen the natural wonders of Yellowstone National Park under winter conditions can attest that it is at no time more spectacularly beautiful than in winter; and

"Whereas Yellowstone National Park throughout the winter presents conditions ideal for the development of one of the greatest possible winter-sports areas in America; and

"Whereas Yellowstone National Park is traversed by an excellent network of highways which, because they are permitted to close during 8 months of the year, blocks travel on highways U S 12, 14, 20, 89, 191, and 287, which converge upon the park; and

"Whereas it has been found that the 50 miles of Yellowstone Park highways which are regularly kept open throughout the winter are kept open at a cost of less than \$60 per mile; and

"Whereas the State of Wyoming keeps open throughout the winter three highway passes which are higher than any highways in Yellowstone Park, and the State of Colorado keeps open throughout the winter 14 highway passes averaging more than a thousand feet higher than any highways in Yellowstone Park; and

"Whereas the presence of a large road block sitting astride the Rocky Mountains constitutes a hazard in military defense operations by limiting communications and unnecessarily channeling transport to fewer highways traversing the region: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved, That district No. 4 of the American Legion, Department of Wyoming, in conference assembled at Basin, Wyo., this 15th day of May 1949, strongly urges the Congress of the United States of America to open Yellowstone National Park throughout the year to the American public, to whom it belongs; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That this resolution be presented to the American Legion in department convention assembled with the recommendation that if it is adopted it be presented to the American Legion in national convention assembled; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to United States Senators Joseph C. O'Mahoney and Lester C. Hunt; Congressman Frank A. Barrett; to the Honorable J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior; Newton Drury, Director of National Park Service; and to Edmund B. Rogers, superintendent of Yellowstone National Park.*

*"BRECK MORAN,*

*Commander, District No. 4, the American Legion, Department of Wyoming.*

*"PAUL S. RUSSELL,*  
*"Acting Adjutant."*

"Whereas the consumption of electric power in the West is increasing at a very rapid rate, in the State of Wyoming alone at the rate of approximately 25 percent per annum, more than doubling every 4 years; and

"Whereas the economic development of the West, as well as the comfort and convenience of its citizens, will be greatly curtailed unless the present electric power shortage is alleviated and future electric power needs anticipated; and

"Whereas it is known that a number of private industrial enterprises, interested in locating in the West, have been discouraged from locating there because of the present electric power shortage; and

"Whereas the prosperity of the citizens of the West depends to a large extent upon development of industry in the West, to balance its economy; and

"Whereas not only will the prosperity of the West be reflected in added prosperity in the balance of the Union, but also the strength of the national military defenses to a considerable extent upon the development of the Rocky Mountain region to form a strong link, binding the Nation together; and

"Whereas the bountiful hydroelectric resources of the West are largely controlled by the Federal Government of the United States of America, upon which is dependent the development of such hydroelectric power resources; and

"Whereas the construction of hydroelectric power projects cannot be accomplished overnight but requires considerable time for proper planning, as well as for construction; and

"Whereas the development of cooperative power service for the convenience of citizens in rural districts is being curtailed for lack of power; and

"Whereas in certain large regions of the West, including the State of Wyoming, an amicable working arrangement has been reached between the United States Bureau of Reclamation, as producer of hydroelectric power, and the private power companies, as distributors and retailers of such power: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved, That district No. 4 of the American Legion, Department of Wyoming, in conference assembled at Basin, Wyo., this 15th day of May 1949, strongly urges the Congress of the United States of America to consider not only the present electric power shortage, crippling the economic development of the State of Wyoming and other parts of the West, but also to anticipate future electric power needs by appropriating sufficient moneys for the planning and construction of adequate hydroelectric power plants, particularly in those regions where no serious conflict exists between the Bureau of Reclamation and the private power companies, and by directing the proper agencies of the United States of America to facilitate such planning and construction; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That the Bureau of Reclamation and the private power companies be strongly urged to come to an amicable working arrangement in other less fortunate regions of the West, to facilitate over-all development; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That this resolution be presented to the American Legion in department convention assembled with the recommendation that, if it is adopted, it be presented to the American Legion in national convention assembled; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, and to United States Senators Joseph C. O'Mahoney and Lester C. Hunt, Congressman Frank A. Barrett, to the Honorable J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, and Michael W. Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation.*

*"BRECK MORAN,*

*Commander, District No. 4, the American Legion, Department of Wyoming.*

*"PAUL S. RUSSELL,*  
*"Acting Adjutant."*

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Whereas the American Legion is deeply concerned with the safety and security of the United States of America; and

"Whereas the American Legion is further concerned at the revelation of the extent of espionage, treason, and subversive activities against the United States Government: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved, That district No. 4 of the American Legion, Department of Wyoming, in conference assembled at Basin, Wyo., this 15th day of May 1949, urges the Congress of the United States of America to cause to be*

enacted a law for the purpose of uncovering acts of espionage, treason, or subversive activities against the United States of America; cause the laws to be revised so that any person suspected of espionage, treason, or acts of carelessness in our Government service may be brought to trial, regardless of lapse of time; make the penalties more severe for anyone found guilty of any such crimes, and cause to be appropriated sufficient funds for the efficient administration of such laws; and be it further

*"Resolved, That this resolution be presented to the American Legion in department convention assembled with the recommendation that, if it is adopted, it be presented to the American Legion in the national convention assembled; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, and to United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and LESTER C. HUNT, and to Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT.*

*"BRECK MORAN,*

*Commander, District No. 4, the American Legion, Department of Wyoming.*

*"PAUL S. RUSSELL,*  
*"Acting Adjutant."*

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Whereas the American Legion is dedicated to the service and well-being of its members and of the citizenry as a whole; and

"Whereas we believe that most effective approach to the national health problem lies in the extension and development of voluntary health insurance; and

"Whereas we believe that Government control of health services would jeopardize free enterprise, establish heavy tax burdens, and unprecedented national deficits: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved, That district No. 4 of the American Legion, Department of Wyoming, in conference assembled at Basin, Wyo., this 15th day of May 1949, strongly opposes the passage of any national health insurance program; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That this resolution be presented to the American Legion in department convention assembled, with the recommendation that, if it is adopted, it be presented to the American Legion in national convention assembled; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, and to United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and LESTER C. HUNT, and Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT.*

*"BRECK MORAN,*

*Commander, District No. 4, the American Legion, Department of Wyoming.*

*"PAUL S. RUSSELL,*  
*"Acting Adjutant."*

To the Committee on Public Works:

"Whereas the people of the West, being in the main part strongly individualistic, believing that the highest destiny of man and the most effective material development of natural resources, agriculture, and industry will be attained only through the maintenance of the greatest possible scope of individual enterprise and freedom; and

"Whereas the establishment of such institutions as valley authorities, wherein a Government-appointed commission has the widest possible power to regulate and control the enterprises, lives, and destinies of the people living in the entire watershed under its jurisdiction, is contrary to the customs, ideals, and aspirations traditional among the people of the West, though possibly acceptable to people of other regions; and

"Whereas it has been proposed to set up such valley authorities in several vast areas of the West, including the entire watersheds



of the Missouri and Columbia Rivers, and such proposals are actually being given serious consideration: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That district No. 4 of the American Legion, Department of Wyoming, in conference assembled this 15th day of May 1949 at Basin, Wyo., condemns all such proposals as valley authorities in the West as bureaucratic and stultifying to material development; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States of America be strongly urged to oppose all such proposals for valley authorities in the West, to preserve that inherent freedom of enterprise and individualism which characterizes the West, for the good not only of the West but also of the Nation as a whole; and be it further

*Resolved*, That this resolution be presented to the American Legion in department convention assembled, with the recommendation that, if it is adopted, it be presented to the American Legion in national convention assembled; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to United States Senators Joseph C. O'Mahoney and Lester C. Hunt, Congressman Frank A. Barrett, to the Honorable J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, and Michael W. Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation.

"BRECK MORAN,

*Commander, District No. 4, the American Legion, Department of Wyoming.*

"PAUL S. RUSSELL,  
*Acting Adjutant.*"

#### SOVIET ATTITUDE TOWARD SPAIN

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD resolutions unanimously adopted by the Catholic Press Association in their annual convention at Denver, Colo., on June 17, 1949.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS UNANIMOUSLY VOTED BY THE CATHOLIC PRESS ASSOCIATION IN ANNUAL CONVENTION AT DENVER, COLO., ON JUNE 17, 1949, AND PUBLISHED IN THE REGISTER SYSTEM OF NEWSPAPERS, ON JUNE 26, 1949.

Whereas our Government has recognized the principle of international law that no nation shall interfere in the internal affairs of any other nation, nor dictate to any nation its form of government; and

Whereas the Soviet Government has tried to impose its will upon the people of Spain; and

Whereas our foreign policy has abetted and is abetting the foreign policy of the Soviet Union vis-à-vis Spain;

We recommend that our Government express our disapproval of Soviet policy by welcoming the Spanish State into the comity and friendship of peace-loving nations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. These resolutions were voted after the delegates to the convention from all parts of the United States had applauded the investiture of the Right Reverend Monsignor Matthew J. Smith, editor in chief of the Register System of newspapers with the insignia of the Order of Isabella the Catholic, in the rank of knight commander, by Don Pablo Merry del Val, counselor on cultural relations of the Spanish Embassy. At the ceremonies, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs, described the work and achievements of Monsignor Smith which led to the award,

one of the highest within the gift of the Spanish Government.

The Right Reverend Monsignor Matthew J. Smith is devoted to America and to the institutions which have made her great. As editor in chief of the Register he has made a continuing and vital contribution to the cause of democracy and understanding.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. R. 2290. A bill to provide for cooperation by the Smithsonian Institution with State, educational, and scientific organizations in the United States for continuing paleontological investigations in areas which will be flooded by the construction of Government dams; with an amendment (Rept. No. 617).

By Mr. HUNT, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution providing for the consolidation of the general appropriation bills, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 616).

By Mr. McGRATH, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1525. A bill to provide for the appointment of a deputy disbursing officer and assistant disbursing officers for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 619);

H. R. 2437. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 7, 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 620);

H. R. 3368. A bill to amend sections 356 and 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, to increase the maximum sum allowable by the court out of the assets of a decedent's estate as a preferred charge for his or her funeral expenses from \$600 to \$1,000; without amendment (Rept. No. 621); and

H. R. 4705. A bill to transfer the office of the probation officer of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, the office of the Register of Wills for the District of Columbia, and the Commission on Mental Health, from the government of the District of Columbia to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, for budgetary and administrative purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 622).

By Mr. FREAR, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1490. A bill to permit investment of funds of insurance companies organized within the District of Columbia in obligations of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; without amendment (Rept. No. 618).

#### ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ENTITLED "PROFITS"

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 116, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 116) submitted by Mr. O'MAHONEY on May 10, 1949, was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic

Report 1,000 additional copies of the report, entitled "Profits," of its Subcommittee on Business Profits.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the cost is \$722.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

#### REPORT OF PERSONNEL AND FUNDS BY INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following report was received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JULY 6, 1949.

#### SENATE INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

##### To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1949, to June 30, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Adlerman, Jerome S., assistant counsel.....	\$7,563.07	\$3,781.50
Bellino, Carmine S., accounting consultant.....	8,906.10	1,113.25
Brosnan, Robert E., assistant counsel.....	8,906.10	1,954.58
Coughlin, Frederick M., assistant counsel.....	6,770.54	1,128.42
Cousins, Mary G., assistant clerk.....	3,873.80	1,881.70
Flanagan, Francis D., chief assistant counsel.....	10,328.14	5,164.02
Hatcher, Howell J., assistant counsel.....	8,511.09	2,506.02
Lee, Lydia, record clerk.....	5,363.55	2,681.76
McCaill, Myles C., investigator.....	6,025.66	3,012.78
McCarthy, Mollie Jo, assistant clerk.....	3,459.98	432.49
McElroy, Robert J., investigator.....	4,535.91	2,143.78
Meacham, Ruth, assistant clerk.....	4,204.86	1,892.16
Minor, Robert W., assistant counsel.....	4,701.44	391.78
Montier, Gladys E., assistant clerk.....	4,122.09	2,005.84
Morris, Constance L., assistant clerk.....	3,625.51	1,757.56
Oliver, Betty F., assistant clerk.....	3,211.69	1,550.64
Rogers, William P., chief counsel.....	10,330.00	5,164.98
Sheridan, James F., investigator.....	6,025.66	3,012.78
Thomas, James H., assistant counsel.....	5,446.32	2,450.84
Young, Ruth M., clerk.....	4,204.86	2,074.80

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure..... \$111,427.03  
Amount expended..... 50,479.77

Balance unexpended..... 60,947.26

JOHN L. McCLELLAN,  
*Chairman.*

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2202. A bill to provide for the transfer of war housing to local communities for use as low-rent housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 2203. A bill to authorize the Palisades Dam and Reservoir project, to authorize the north side pumping division and related

works, to provide for the disposition of reserved space in American Falls Reservoir, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 2204. A bill for the relief of Rudolph Farcher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2205. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into contract for the removal of sludge; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2206. A bill to provide for the representation of indigent defendants in criminal cases in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2207. A bill for the relief of George Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2208. A bill to amend laws relating to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes;

S. 2209. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy from the District of Columbia; and

S. 2210. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength," approved June 3, 1942 (56 Stat. 306); to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. MURRAY) introduced Senate bill 2211, to provide for a survey of sickness in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FREAR (by request):

S. 2212. A bill to provide for improved financial control over the operations of the Post Office Department; and

S. 2213. A bill relating to the appointment of postmasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 2214. A bill to authorize the construction at Suitland, Md., of a building or group of buildings for the servicing and storage of film records; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 2215. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

(Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. CAIN, Mr. IVES, and Mr. DOWNEY) introduced Senate bill 2216, to authorize the President of the United States, under certain conditions, to appoint boards of inquiry with power to make binding recommendations with respect to labor disputes in trade between the continental United States and the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to provide an increase in the authorization for the Federal National Mortgage Association; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### INCREASE IN AUTHORIZATION FOR FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAYBANK subsequently said: Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 114) to provide an increase in the authorization for the Federal National Mortgage Association, introduced by me earlier today, and I submit a report (No. 615) thereon. In order to save

time, I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar, and, without objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report (No. 615) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred Senate Joint Resolution 114, a joint resolution to provide an increase in the authorization for the Federal National Mortgage Association, having considered the same, report favorably thereon and recommend that the joint resolution do pass.

#### GENERAL STATEMENT

Section 1 increases the Federal National Mortgage Association authorization by approximately \$500,000,000. This increased authorization would be based on the outstanding amount of Federal National Mortgage Association mortgage purchases and commitments in place of the present complicated formula for the Federal National Mortgage Association authorization, based on capital and surplus, in section 302 of the National Housing Act.

Presently the Federal National Mortgage Association authorization amounts to approximately \$1,000,000,000. Of this amount, as of July 5, 1949, about \$41,000,000 remained available for purchases. The total amount used during the month of May exceeded \$122,000,000. During the month of June the amount used was \$199,000,000 and during the first 5 days of July \$22,000,000 were used. It is therefore essential that an immediate increase be made in the authorization in order to assure home-mortgage lenders that the secondary market will remain available, and to assure that no "run" will be made on the present unused amount of the authorization. Five hundred million dollars seems adequate for this purpose until the Congress has an opportunity to consider and act upon the pending legislation providing for a larger amount on a more permanent basis.

Section 2 amends section 4 (c) of the Reconstruction Finance Act to make a similar \$500,000,000 increase in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation lending authority. The funds for Federal National Mortgage Association operations are borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This increase in the amount of loans which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may have outstanding is necessary to enable it to furnish the additional funds needed by the Federal National Mortgage Association and to carry out its other lending programs.

#### HEALTH SURVEY

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, not since 1936 has there been a national survey of the health of the American people. I introduce for appropriate reference a bill authorizing the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service in the Federal Security Agency of the United States to make such a survey.

The bill (S. 2211) to provide for a survey of sickness in the United States, introduced by Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. MURRAY), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

#### UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TOBEY submitted sundry amendments intended to be proposed by him to the amendment of the committee to the bill (H. R. 4080) to unify, consoli-

date, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### HORACE J. FENTON—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 621) for the relief of Horace J. Fenton, and that it be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. A similar bill was considered by the Post Office and Civil Service last year, and it is the judgment of the members of the Judiciary Committee that it should be referred to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 242. An act to provide for the conferring of the degree of bachelor of science upon graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy;

H. R. 2572. An act to extend to commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey the provisions of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946; and

H. R. 4829. An act to authorize the President to appoint Paul A. Smith as representative of the United States to the Council of the International Civil Aviation Organization without affecting his status and perquisites as a commissioned officer of the Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 388. An act to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1354. An act to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California;

H. R. 1726. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Hot Springs, Ark., a perpetual easement for the construction and operation of a water-main pipe line;

H. R. 2475. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell to Albert M. Lewis, Jr., certain land in the State of Florida;

H. R. 2517. An act directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to Palm Beach County, Fla.;

H. R. 2678. An act to amend section 5 of the act approved July 10, 1890, as amended, relating to the admission into the Union of the State of Wyoming, so as to permit the leasing of school lands within such State for mineral purposes for terms in excess of 10 years;

H. R. 2724. An act to provide a decree of competency for United States Indians in certain cases;

H. R. 2869. An act to authorize an appropriation in aid of a system of drainage and sanitation for the city of Polson, Mont.;

H. R. 2984. An act to consolidate the Parker Dam power project and the Davis Dam project;

H. R. 3285. An act authorizing the replacement and reconstruction by the Bureau of



Reclamation of certain bridges across the Franklin Canal of the Rio Grande project of the Bureau of Reclamation, within the city of El Paso, Tex., and authorizing appropriation for that purpose;

H. R. 3589. An act to convey to the city of Miles City, State of Montana, certain lands in Custer County, Mont., for use as an industrial site;

H. R. 3667. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Lenora Farwell Fritzler;

H. R. 4073. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of New York of certain historic property situated within Port Niagara State Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4208. An act to add certain surplus land to Petersburg National Military Park, Va., to define the boundaries thereof, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4353. An act to amend section 2 of the act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens;

H. R. 4510. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the school board of Klamath County, Oreg., for the construction, extension and improvement of public-school facilities in Klamath County, Oreg., to be available to all Indian and non-Indian children without discrimination;

H. R. 4755. An act to authorize the appointment of an Advisory Committee on Indian Affairs;

H. R. 4943. An act to amend the act providing for the admission of the State of Idaho into the Union by increasing the period for which leases may be made of public lands granted to the State by such act for educational purposes;

H. R. 5034. An act to authorize the taxation of Indian land holdings in the town of Lodge Grass, Mont., to assist in financing a municipal water supply and sewerage system;

H. R. 5170. An act to further the policy enunciated in the Historic Sites Act (49 Stat. 666) and to facilitate public participation in the preservation of sites, buildings, and objects of national significance or interest and providing a national trust for historic preservation;

H. R. 5205. An act to quitclaim certain property in Enid, Okla., to H. B. Bass; and

H. R. 5310. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of California over the lands and residents of the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation in said State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 588. An act for the relief of Col. David R. Wolverton, United States Army; retired;

H. R. 734. An act for the relief of Curtis R. Enos;

H. R. 1028. An act to legalize the admission into the United States of Edmea Pachio;

H. R. 1038. An act for the relief of William Richard Geoffrey Malpas;

H. R. 1105. An act for the relief of Hazel L. Giles;

H. R. 1132. An act for the relief of Mabel H. Slocum;

H. R. 1447. An act for the relief of Ethel Roth;

H. R. 1493. An act for the relief of Cecil L. Howell;

H. R. 1679. An act for the relief of Mrs. Skio Takayama Hull;

H. R. 1861. An act for the relief of Elizabeth and Lawrence Wong;

H. R. 1864. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Mitsuo Higa, a minor, and Hilo Sugar Co.;

H. R. 1979. An act for the relief of Soo Hoo Yet Tuck;

H. R. 2091. An act for the relief of Jack McCollum;

H. R. 2239. An act for the relief of the estate of W. M. West;

H. R. 2344. An act for the relief of Charles W. Miles;

H. R. 2602. An act for the relief of John B. Boyle;

H. R. 2608. An act for the relief of C. H. Dutton Co., of Kalamazoo, Mich.;

H. R. 3598. An act for the relief of Mrs. Katherine Gehringer;

H. R. 3618. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Marcia Moss Carroll, a minor, and Charles P. Carroll;

H. R. 3718. An act for the relief of George Seeman Jensen;

H. R. 3768. An act for the relief of Mrs. Justa G. Vda. de Guido, Belen de Guido, Mulla de Guido, and Oscar de Guido;

H. R. 3816. An act for the relief of Alexis Leger;

H. R. 4306. An act for the relief of Zora B. Vulich;

H. R. 4854. An act for the relief of Mrs. Miriam G. Wornum;

H. R. 4875. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code relating to travel expense allowances for Government employee witnesses;

H. R. 4948. An act relating to the policing of the building and grounds of the Supreme Court of the United States;

H. R. 5287. An act to amend title 28, United States Code, section 90, to create a Swainsboro Division in the southern district of Georgia, with terms of court to be held at Swainsboro; and

H. R. 5299. An act for the relief of Mrs. Giovanna Folio Discopolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 459. An act to authorize the payment of employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry for overtime duty performed at establishments which prepare virus, serum, toxin, or analogous products for use in the treatment of domestic animals;

H. R. 1516. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, so as to provide annual automatic within-grade promotions for hourly employees of the custodial service; and

H. R. 3383. An act to provide that extra compensation for night work paid officers and employees of the United States shall be computed on the basis of either standard or daylight saving time; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4406. An act to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 5328. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the city and county of San Francisco; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution to provide for the coinage of a medal in recognition of the distinguished services of Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### THE BRANNAN PLAN—EDITORIAL FROM NEBRASKA FARMER

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from a recent issue of the Nebraska Farmer, dealing with the Brannan plan for stabilizing prices and making agriculture more secure, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### BUSINESS CONDITIONS IN CASPER, WYO.

[Mr. HUNT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement with reference to business conditions in the city of Casper, Wyo., during the past 9 months, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### FAILURE OF STATE SOCIALISM IN BRITAIN—ARTICLE BY CONSTANTINE BROWN

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Britain Sends Financial SOS to United States to Save Failing State Socialism," written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Evening Star of July 6, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### COMPARISON BETWEEN BRITISH LABOR GOVERNMENT AND FAIR DEAL GOVERNMENT—EDITORIAL FROM BOSTON HERALD

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Two Say 'Enough'" published in the Boston Herald of June 25, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### COLUMBIA VALLEY ADMINISTRATION—ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Kilowatts Out to Sea," written by Richard L. Neuberger and published in the Reporter for June 21, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### DEMOCRATIC PARTY'S LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a report on the program of the Democratic Party, together with recommendations adopted at a mass meeting at Chattanooga, Tenn., on May 28, under the sponsorship of the Americans for Democratic Action, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ROOM FOR PRIVATE BUILDERS—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Room for Private Builders," published in the New York Times of July 6, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### HELEN REMBERT CARLOSS

[Mr. STENNIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article in tribute to the late Helen Rembert Carloss, of Mississippi, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON A GENERAL FLOOD CONTROL AND RIVER AND HARBOR BILL

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to announce to the Members of the Senate that a Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works will begin hearings on a general flood control and river and harbor bill on Tuesday, July 12, 1949, in room 412, Senate Office Building, at 10 a. m.

The House Committee on Public Works has completed several weeks of hearings on a similar bill and has just recently reported House bill 5472. In anticipation of early action by the House, and because many Senators have expressed their interest in further authorizations during this session, the Senate committee will begin hearings on flood control and river and harbor reports which have been sent to Congress subsequent to the House hearings. Also to be heard are several Senate bills covering specific projects or rivers, as well as modifications or other proposals not heard by the House committee.

All the testimony taken in the House hearings will be considered by the committee, and to save time, it is hoped that

there will be no duplication of the House testimony. The committee will take up chiefly new reports, and any proposed changes, additions, or deletions in the House bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be printed the tentative schedule of hearings.

There being no objection, the schedule was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The tentative schedule for the hearings is as follows:

Tuesday, July 12, 1949: Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Engineers, general statement; Quinby Creek, Va.; Norfolk Harbor, Va., S. 1774; Biloxi Harbor, Miss.

Wednesday, July 13, 1949: Mississippi River at Rock Island, Ill.; Mississippi River at Hamburg, Ill.; Bayfield Harbor, Wis.; Baker Bay, Wash.; Cheboygan Harbor and River, Michigan; Bradford, Pa.

Thursday, July 14, 1949: Monongahela River, Pa., and W. Va.; Tampa Harbor, Fla.

Friday, July 15, 1949: Big Sandy River, Ky., Va., and W. Va.

Tuesday, July 19, 1949: Rio Grande Basin, N. Mex., S. 1392.

Wednesday, July 20, 1949: Various bills authorizing preliminary examinations and surveys. Other bills and projects not heard previously.

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCLELLAN REGARDING RECOMMENDATIONS OF HOOVER COMMISSION REPORTS ON GENERAL MANAGEMENT AND ON BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I issued yesterday after receipt of a letter from the Bureau of the Budget discussing that part of the Hoover Commission reports which relates to budgeting and accounting.

I may say that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is calling upon each department and agency of the Government to comment upon those reports and recommendations of the Hoover Commission as they affect the particular departments. As we receive reports and letters from the departments I shall place them in the RECORD for the benefit of Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, CHAIRMAN, SENATE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 6, 1949.—Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN today released an extended letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget regarding recommendations of two Hoover Commission reports on General Management and on Budgeting and Accounting. The letter was prepared at the request of the Senate Committee on Expenditures and relates only to those recommendations which directly affect the Budget Bureau.

Similar letters from other departments and agencies will be periodically released by the committee, relating to recommendations of the Hoover Commission in its various reports as they affect such establishments, and administrative actions taken to implement

those which may be effectuated without legislative action.

The Budget Bureau is in agreement with the recommendations in the Hoover Commission report on general management, with minor reservations, stating that "this does not mean that the Bureau necessarily agrees with all specific recommendations for re-grouping made by the Commission." The Director of the Bureau also outlines in detail his position relative to the specific recommendations in the report on budgeting and accounting, with which he is likewise in general agreement, including the adoption of a performance budget, revision of the appropriation structure, and the division of budget estimates into current operating expenditures and capital outlays. In this report, the Commission recommended that "an Accountant General be established under the Secretary of the Treasury, with authority to prescribe general accounting methods and enforce accounting procedures . . . subject to the approval of the Comptroller General within the powers now conferred upon him by the Congress, and to combine accounts and reports on a summary basis. To these recommendations the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is in disagreement. He states:

"The Bureau does not agree with these recommendations. The basic weakness of these proposals for dealing with accounting and auditing is the lack of clear assignments of responsibility to the executive and legislative branches for the performance of these separate but closely related functions. Generally, the Bureau subscribes to the belief that accounting is an administrative function and should be the responsibility of the executive branch; and that, on the other hand, suitable provisions should be made to furnish advice and recommendations to the Congress based on an independent audit made by an agency under their control. The Bureau does not feel that the Hoover Commission proposals would result in a clear definition of responsibility but rather would make it impossible for either branch of the Government to move without full concurrence of the other.

"The Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and the Treasury Department are currently engaged in a joint program to improve Government accounting. It is our opinion that this approach is best suited to securing immediate results. As work progresses on this program, needed changes in legislation will be identified and proposed."

In the Hoover Commission report on budgeting and accounting, Commissioners John L. McClellan and Carter Manasco also disagreed, on a somewhat different basis, with the majority recommendation that the present statutory duties and responsibilities of the Comptroller General should be changed (pp. 47-54).

The reports have been submitted to subcommittees composed of Senators McClellan, EASTLAND, HUMPHREY, MUNDT, and VANDENBERG, to consider S. 942, to establish principles and policies to govern generally the management of the executive branch of the Government; and of Senators McClellan and MCCARTHY to consider S. 2054, to authorize the President to determine the form of the national budget and of departmental estimates, etc. These subcommittees will procure specific information from officials of the affected agencies in the form of reports on the pending legislation, and hold such hearings as may be necessary to develop the facts on which recommendations may be made to the full Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. The letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,  
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,  
Washington, D. C., July 5, 1949.  
Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,  
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures  
in the Executive Departments,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: This is in reply to your letter of May 23 requesting the Bureau of the Budget to report on those recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government which affect the Bureau.

In a very real sense, all of the recommendations of the Commission in all of its reports are of direct interest to the Bureau of the Budget since the Bureau is responsible for assisting the President in improving organization and management and in achieving efficiency and economy throughout the Government. The Bureau has been working with your committee, with other congressional committees, and with the agencies on many of the recommendations affecting specific agencies. In this letter, therefore, I am confining my comments to those proposals which directly affect the organization or operations of the Bureau, itself.

Most of the recommendations which have a direct effect on the Bureau appear in the report entitled "Budgeting and Accounting." I should like to comment also on some recommendations of equal significance to the Bureau which appear in the initial report of the Commission, entitled "General Management of the Executive Branch."

#### GENERAL MANAGEMENT OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

1. The Commission proposes, as its first recommendation, that there be created "a more orderly grouping of the functions of Government into major departments and agencies under the President" (p. 7).

The Bureau is in accord with this recommendation. It hopes to assist in the accomplishment of some of the necessary changes by preparing for the President reorganization plans which he feels are needed. Other changes would require direct legislation by the Congress. I would like to add, however, that while the Bureau is in favor of "a more orderly grouping" to provide proper structure and greater efficiency, this does not mean that the Bureau necessarily agrees with all specific recommendations for re-grouping made by the Commission.

2. The Commission recommends that the Bureau of the Budget be designated "Office of the Budget" in the Executive Office of the President (pp. 10, 12-13).

The Bureau has no objection to this change.

3. The Commission recommends that "statutory authority over the operating departments should not be vested in any staff members or staff agency of the President's Office" and uses as an example the fact that authority for setting personnel ceilings lies in the Bureau of the Budget but should be vested in the President (p. 15).

The Bureau agrees with this recommendation. With respect to the specific example given, the Bureau agrees that if personnel ceilings are to be fixed, authority should be vested in the President. However, I would like to point out that the setting of personnel ceilings is an unnecessary control at this time since it accomplishes nothing which could not be achieved through strengthened budgetary controls. The President's views on this subject were stated in his budget message of 1948 (p. M57).

4. The Commission recommends that "the President should not be prevented by statute from reorganizing the President's Office and from transferring functions and personnel from one part of it to another" (p. 15).

The Bureau concurs.



5. The Commission makes at least 16 recommendations looking toward the strengthening of management in the departments and agencies (pp. 34-40).

The Bureau is in general agreement with the recommendations of the Commission. Renewed emphasis is being placed by the Bureau on developing a program for working with the departments and agencies in order to bring about improved operations and to achieve greater economy and efficiency. This program calls for a regular appraisal of agency management improvement programs and assistance to the agencies in strengthening their management facilities. Initial plans for this management appraisal program have been completed and instructions concerning it have been included in the call for 1951 estimates issued to the departments and agencies. These steps will help strengthen departmental management, although it would be necessary to have more funds available to do a complete job.

#### BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING

1. The Commission recommends that "the whole budgetary concept of the Federal Government should be refashioned by the adoption of a budget based upon functions, activities, and projects," designated by the Commission as a "performance budget" (p. 8).

The Bureau has for some time believed that the goal of a performance budget is desirable, and has already developed plans for achieving it. These plans require changes which are complex and affect most executive agencies and the Appropriations Committees. We hope that the 1951 budget will make a major stride toward a performance basis and that continuing action will be taken over a period of several years to accomplish the objective completely.

2. The Commission recommends "to the Congress that a complete survey of the appropriation structure should be undertaken without delay" (p. 13).

The Bureau agrees on the urgency of undertaking such a study and has been working on the problem of appropriation structure for a number of years. Its interest in simplifying appropriation structure is illustrated by its work with the Department of the Air Force in the establishment of an appropriation structure for the Department. (See 1950 recommended appropriations on page A82 of the 1950 Budget.) The Bureau is also currently working with departments and Appropriations Committees in revising present appropriation structures. Since improvements in appropriation structure are closely related to improvements in accounting systems, the two must go hand in hand.

3. The Commission recommends that "the budget estimates of all operating departments and agencies of the Government should be divided into two primary categories—current operating expenditures and capital outlays" (p. 16).

The Bureau is currently making an analysis to determine which items in the Budget should be classified as current operating expenditures and which as capital outlays, recoverable expenditures, or developmental expenditures. This whole problem has been given considerable attention by the Bureau staff. In this connection, I am enclosing a copy of a letter and staff memorandum commenting on Senate Joint Resolution 151, Eightieth Congress, which was sent to Senator Aiken last year, and which sets forth Bureau views on and discusses some of the complications involved in the segregation of capital, developmental, and recoverable expenditures. It is hoped that the results of our present study will be completed in time to be considered in connection with the classification contained in the 1952 Budget.

In connection with the Bureau's current work on performance budgeting, it is planned to separate major capital outlay from cur-

rent expense in the activity schedules of the 1951 Budget. A complete separation cannot be made with present accounting systems. Changes in these systems are being worked out by the staffs of the General Accounting Office, Treasury Department, and the Bureau of the Budget in their joint accounting project.

4. The Commission recommends that a clarification be made as to whether the Budget Bureau and the President have the right to reduce appropriated amounts during the year for which they were provided, and "in any event, that the President should have authority to reduce expenditures under appropriations, if the purposes intended by the Congress are still carried out" (p. 17).

The Bureau concurs completely with this recommendation.

5. The Commission recommends "that the review and revision (of agency estimates) by the Estimates Division . . . be done from the first to the final stages in conjunction with representatives of the Administrative Management and Fiscal Divisions" (p. 23).

It has always been the policy of the Bureau that its divisions work closely together in the review and revision of agency estimates, and we believe that we have had considerable success in carrying out that policy. Within the past year, even further emphasis has been given to developing close working relationships.

The Administrative Management Division cooperates with the Estimates Division in numerous ways, principally by reviewing questions of organization and management arising during the budget-review process. During the past year the two Divisions, for example, together developed staffing guides for use in evaluating agency budget estimates for personnel activities; pay roll, leave, and retirement activities; voucher-examination activities; and property activities. Similarly, emphasis is now being given to the joint appraisal by both Divisions of agency management improvement programs. Statements on these programs are to be submitted by the agencies along with their 1951 budget estimates. Other examples of problems on which the two Divisions cooperate include such items as estimates for motor-vehicle replacement, funds to be provided for warehousing, requirements for business machines, and money for records administration. There is a particularly close relation in the international-activities field, in which we have one International Activities Branch handling both estimates and management problems for this area.

The Division of Fiscal Analysis works on a continuous day-to-day basis with the Estimates Division. Some examples of the way in which the two Divisions cooperate in the budget process are in the determination of over-all budget policies, the determination of desirable balance among different Government programs, the setting of agency budget ceilings, the analyzing of proposed legislation, and the drafting for the President of budget messages, budget previews, and budget reviews. Both Divisions, as well as the other divisions of the Bureau, are represented in the Director's review sessions in which final Bureau decisions are reached on agency budgets.

The other divisions of the Bureau also work closely with the Estimates Division in the processing of agency budgets. The Division of Statistical Standards assists in reviewing the estimates for statistical activities; the Legislative Reference Division works with the estimates examiners in seeing to it that the President's legislative recommendations are properly reflected in the budget; and the Field Service not only investigates specific problems that appear in the agency estimates, but also sends to Wash-

ington certain staff members who are familiar with agency problems in the field to assist in the processing of estimates.

6. "The Commission recommends the development of much closer relations between the constituent divisions of the Office of the Budget and with such agencies as the President's personal staff, the Treasury Department, the Economic Adviser, and the National Security Resources Board" (p. 26).

As noted in the previous paragraph, the Bureau has always striven for close relations among its own divisions, and has given more emphasis to obtaining this goal within the past year.

The Bureau is also in favor of close relations with the other units mentioned. I, personally, have frequent contacts with the top-level officials of the other organizations mentioned, and my staff works continuously with the staffs of these groups through informal contacts, exchange of memoranda, conferences, etc., on a great variety of problems including analysis of proposed legislation and participation in certain budget hearings. Our fiscal-analysis staff, for example, works constantly with the Council of Economic Advisers staff on economic conditions and developments, and our Division of Statistical Standards works continuously with the Council on problems of availability and adequacy of basic statistical data. The Bureau is also represented on many inter-agency working teams set up by the Council to work on special projects assigned by the President. Certain members of our administrative management, estimates, and statistical standards staff have been working practically full time with the National Security Resources Board on problems of common concern. In addition, the Bureau is represented on the interdepartmental staff group set up by the NSRB. Relationships with both the Council of Economic Advisers and the National Security Resources Board have been steadily growing stronger and more comprehensive ever since the establishment of these two new agencies. The location of all three groups in the same building has been an important factor in aiding close relationships. Adoption of the Hoover Commission recommendations dealing with the Executive Office of the President should serve further to strengthen these relationships.

Relations with the White House staff have always been close, and have been especially so the past year as indicated by the large number of requests for assistance made by White House staff to the Bureau.

The Bureau of the Budget and the Treasury Department have been working closely together in many ways. A good example is the work of the two agencies in correlating receipts and expenditure estimates. Another example is the work of both organizations, together with the General Accounting Office, on a joint project to improve Government accounting. There is also a large amount of informal cooperation on a day-to-day basis on such problems as setting up appropriation symbols and titles, the treatment of certain items in Treasury reports, methods of getting certain financial information, etc.

7. The Commission recommends that the Administrative Management Division "should be expanded and strengthened" (p. 28).

The Bureau agrees with this recommendation. The necessity for Government economy, the Commission recommendations, the impact of the Federal Budget on the economy of the country, and other factors have made the work of this Division more important than ever. We have tried to meet the demands on the Division by concentrating our energies on major problems only, and by developing programs and approaches which are the most effective in achieving economy and efficiency throughout the Government. Ultimately, however, this Division can only be adequately strengthened by the addition of more staff members.

It should be pointed out that this recommendation of the Commission is impossible to carry out in the light of the report of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices of the House Committee on Appropriations which stated that the 10 percent reduction which it recommended in the Bureau's appropriations for 1950 be applied "primarily" to this Division and two others. This proposed reduction, taken together with last year's reduction which was also aimed at this Division and two or three others, would result in a serious restriction and weakening of the Division (approximately 40 percent reduction over the 2-year period) rather than in expanding and strengthening it.

8. The Commission recommends that the Bureau of the Budget, "in dealing with the budgets of the executive departments and agencies . . . should place much greater emphasis on the developing of policies and standards to govern the preparation of estimates, and on the development of adequate budget work in the departments themselves, and comparatively less on the review by its own staff of the details of departmental estimates" (pp. 28-29).

The Bureau agrees with this recommendation and has been endeavoring to carry it out over a period of many years. The recent establishment of target budget ceilings to be used for planning purposes, for example, is one way by which decentralization has been accomplished. The joint accounting project now under way by the General Accounting Office, the Treasury Department, and the Budget Bureau is also aimed at bringing about improvements which will achieve this objective.

The establishment of staffing guides is another example of standards set to help the agencies plan their budgets. The management appraisal program now under way also will enable the agencies to improve their own budget work. A major effort to work with the agencies in improving their budgeting has been the periodic conduct of a series of conferences on budget formulation and budget execution attended by agency budget officials.

The development of adequate policies and standards, however, and the rendering of assistance to agencies in strengthening their budget work, are difficult, long-time programs. As these objectives are accomplished, the Bureau will further decentralize budget activities.

9. The Commission recommends that staff work be done on the problem of the field services (pp. 28-29).

The Bureau agrees that a comprehensive management study should be made of the Federal field services. Provision for beginning such a study was made in preparing the Bureau's 1950 budget estimate. However, if this budget estimate is reduced by 10 percent as recommended by the House, there is little likelihood that staff time will be available to make such a study in 1950.

10. "The Commission recommends that the President be given the means and authority to supervise all publications of the executive branch and that he delegate this authority to a responsible official in the Office of the Budget" (p. 30).

The Bureau concurs in this recommendation only to the extent that centralized control over publications should be exercised through the setting up of policies and standards and through assisting the departments and agencies to establish their own effective control systems.

11. The Commission recommends "that authority be given to the President to effect improvements in statistical activities and that such authority be delegated to the Director of the Division of Statistical Services" (p. 31), and that the "Division of Statistical Standards of the Office of the Budget should be strengthened" (p. 96).

The Bureau agrees with these recommendations except that it believes that authority to effect improvements in statistical activities should be delegated to the Director of the Bureau rather than directly to a division within the Bureau. I would again like to point out that the House action including this division as one of those to bear the brunt of the recommended reduction in the Bureau's 1950 estimate, if adopted by the Congress, would make it impossible to carry out these recommendations. Weakening of the Statistical Standards Division would force the Government to lose some of the economies annually brought about by the work of this division, and seriously hamper the division in its efforts to help make the Government's statistical product as reliable and widely useful as possible.

12. The Commission makes two recommendations concerning the establishment of an Accountant General; to wit, that "a. An Accountant General be established under the Secretary of the Treasury with authority to prescribe general accounting methods and enforce accounting procedures. These methods and procedures should be subject to the approval of the Comptroller General within the powers now conferred upon him by the Congress," and "b. The Accountant General should, on a report basis, combine agency accounts into the summary accounts of the Government and produce financial reports for the information of the Chief Executive, the Congress, and the public" (p. 39).

The Bureau does not agree with these recommendations. The basic weakness of these proposals for dealing with accounting and auditing is the lack of clear assignments of responsibility to the executive and legislative branches for the performance of these separate but closely related functions. Generally, the Bureau subscribes to the belief that accounting is an administrative function and should be the responsibility of the executive branch; and that, on the other hand, suitable provisions should be made to furnish advice and recommendations to the Congress based on an independent audit made by an agency under their control. The Bureau does not feel that the Hoover Commission proposals would result in a clear definition of responsibility but rather would make it impossible for either branch of the Government to move without full concurrence of the other.

The Bureau of the Budget, the General Accounting Office, and the Treasury Department are currently engaged in a joint program to improve Government accounting. It is our opinion that this approach is best suited to securing immediate results. As work progresses on this program, needed changes in legislation will be identified and proposed.

13. The Commission recommends: "(a) That the practice of sending millions of expenditure vouchers and supporting papers to Washington be stopped as far as possible" (p. 42), but "(b) in view of the fantastic growth of detail that a spot sampling process at various places where the expenditure vouchers and papers are administratively checked might be substituted for much of the present procedure of bringing all those documents to Washington" (p. 43).

The recommendations are of principal concern to the General Accounting Office and not to the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau, however, has long been aware of the existence of a problem in this area and would like to go on record as being in favor of the adoption of those recommendations as a method of solving it.

I hope that these comments will be helpful to your committee and would be happy to furnish additional information on any specific points at your request. I think it is clear that we are trying to effectuate most

of the recommendations concerning the Bureau. While we are looking for substantial improvements from these actions, it is too early, as yet, to estimate the amount of monetary savings which will result.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK PACE, Jr.,  
Director.

#### ADMINISTRATION OF THE GOVERNMENT OF ALASKA—EDITORIAL AND NEWS COMMENT

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, at the request of the citizens of Alaska, I ask that several articles appearing recently in their daily newspapers be printed in the body of the RECORD. First is an editorial appearing in the Anchorage Daily Times of February 18, 1949; then an editorial appearing in the same newspaper under date of May 24, 1949; following that, an editorial which appeared in the Daily News-Miner, of Fairbanks, under date of June 17, 1949; and finally a release which appeared in the June 21 issue of the same newspaper. The headline of this last article reads: "Five Million Dollars Frozen in Alaska." The people of Alaska asked that these articles be printed in the RECORD in order that Members of Congress could be advised on the situation in the Territory.

There being no objection, the editorials and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Anchorage Daily Times of February 18, 1948]

#### GRUENING SHOULD STAY

Opposition to the appointment of Ernest Gruening for another 4 years as governor of Alaska, is attracting widespread attention in the States as well as Alaska.

Press reports indicate that he will be reappointed but point out that lobbyists are "beating at the backdoor" of the White House to oppose him. Drew Pearson, author of Washington Merry-Go-Round said on February 11, "they don't like his drive for lower maritime freight rates, and for higher taxes on fishing, canning and shipping." He also referred to Gil Skinner, president of the Alaska Steamship Co., as a "skillful backstage operator for the lobby," and predicted Alaskan big business will be disappointed because Governor Gruening is going to be reappointed.

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch recently commented editorially that Mr. Skinner has more political might in Washington than 90,000 Alaskans. A Boston newspaper excoriated Seattle recently for opposition to Gruening emanating from that city.

Whether Gruening is to remain as Alaska's chief executive is a matter of public interest within the Territory. Because the appointment is in the hands of a Democratic President, it is a matter to be fought out within the councils of that party. No Republican is eligible for consideration.

President Truman's choice is either to reappoint Gruening or find a suitable replacement. Alaskan Democrats who oppose Gruening would rather see Norman R. Walker of Ketchikan or Edward Coffey of this city get the appointment. But to the majority of Alaskans these men stand for the opposite to what they want. They are blamed for the fiasco of the last legislature when, under their leadership, the Senate plunged the Territory into a financial morass, jeopardized statehood and otherwise flaunted the wishes of the people.

Washington State Democrats would have, the President appoint one Herbert Algeo, the fair-haired boy of Governor Wallgren. Or they would favor Hugh Mitchell, the unsuccessful candidate for Senator who could use



the prestige that would come with the title of governor. Both these men, incidentally, could be expected to eliminate the necessity for a lobby to offset efforts to obtain lower freight rates and higher taxes on fisheries and shipping.

From the Alaskan point of view, Gruening is irreplaceable and invaluable. Through his vigorous leadership he has made an enduring spot for himself in the history of the Territory. Never before has the "little guy" living in Alaska been made to realize his potentialities and powers as a builder and citizen.

He is the spearhead of the great statehood movement, the efforts to obtain cheap transportation and local controls essential to development. He has been fearless in his stand against remote controls wherever he has found them—in Government or business.

His political risks have been perilous as he taunted powerful absentee interests in behalf of the little people of Alaska who often find themselves shackled under the existing economic set-up.

Gruening has championed Alaskans over all else. He has made his office a most vital force in behalf of the Territory.

To the unbiased, loyal, sincere Alaskans who love their vast northland, there is no man other than Gruening. Failure to reappoint him could be the result of nothing other than a victory of absentee lobbyists over the will of the people.

[From the Anchorage Daily Times of May 24, 1949]

#### DEMOCRATS FAILING IN THEIR STEWARDSHIP

During the last few months a pattern of events which is alarming in its implications has come to light under the Democratic administration of the Territorial government.

The pattern points to what may be a weakness that could consign the Democratic Party to oblivion in future elections. Certainly, if events of the future fall into the same pattern it is safe to predict an overwhelming defeat for the Democrats as soon as Alaskans have the opportunity to express this disapproval at the polls.

We refer to the ever-increasing manifestations of failure in stewardship on the part of the Democrats—instances that would cause any man of ordinary prudence to pause in his day's activities to question whether the party is trustworthy.

For 16 years the Democrats have had full charge of the administration of Alaska's government. Many of those years have found the Democrats split among themselves so that little in the way of effective legislation could be realized. But in the last election, the voters ended even that obstacle by placing the legislative as well as the administrative powers at the disposal of the official Democratic Party.

That development, while a great victory for the party, was a final investiture by the people of the officials in office with all the powers in their command to carry out what the people believed to be a sincere, progressive program of Alaskan development through expansion of governmental services.

The people have taxed themselves to give the Democrats a larger Treasury on which to draw. They voted the officials more power than they have ever held before.

At the same time the expectations of the people reached a new high as they looked forward with optimism to the fulfillment of their wishes by their public servants in office.

But the dismal pattern of failure began to take shape while the legislature was still in the act of handing the Democrats the powers and the money they were convinced their administrative officials needed.

During the legislative session the head of the veterans administration resigned under fire after a house investigation revealed al-

leged irregularities in the handling of funds collected through a sales tax.

Another legislative investigation resulted in the removal of the head of the department of public welfare and enactment of a law requiring that his successor be a man whose training and experience qualified him for this important administrative position.

Within the last few weeks the Territorial treasurer resigned and was immediately charged with embezzlement of more than \$23,000 in public funds during the last 4 years.

Meanwhile, the administration at Juneau apparently adopted a policy of strengthening its political position in the capital city—where it has always been weak—by bestowing it with favors regardless of the best interests of Alaska as a whole, or effectiveness in administration.

The Coast Guard headquarters were stolen from Ketchikan to be placed at Juneau. The new territorial building, authorized by the last legislature, was assured for Juneau in a maneuver that virtually shut out any consideration of other possible locations. The National Guard headquarters were established at Juneau in wanton disregard of the nature of the program, the purpose for which it was authorized or promises made to legislators. It is safe to predict that the headquarters for the 1950 census will be located at Juneau as quickly as it is established, regardless of the fact that the center of population is some 800 miles west.

Salaries of the faithful party workers on the public pay rolls at Juneau have been increased substantially. Many new positions have been created since the new taxes were enacted.

At the moment, revenues from the new taxes are reported to be falling below expectations. Many months will pass before the treasury is fattened as anticipated. But the Territory has a bigger stable than ever to maintain at Juneau. Indications are that indigents will find their allowances cut in the immediate future. Foster parents, providing care for dependent children, will once more find their checks from the Territory decreasing in size. Other governmental activities will be curbed and responsibilities shunned.

Two appointments especially are worthy of note in this pattern of events. That of Henry Roden is singular because he is widely known as "anti-Gruening" and his membership on the board of administration bids well to throw the control of that powerful body to the minority faction of the Democratic Party. What sort of political deal was made for this patronage may some day be known.

The appointment of Henry Harmon as head of the department of public welfare was open defiance of the provision of the law requiring training and experience as a qualification. Harmon has neither.

Any one, or perhaps two or three, of these events, alone, might not be regarded as setting a pattern that is alarming. But when they are all lined up together the implications cannot be overlooked.

Irregularities in the handling of public funds are by far the worst and most shocking of all the pattern. The voters of Alaska can be depended upon to have no truck with such irresponsibility in high places.

The fact that the Democratic administration failed to conduct an audit ordered in 1947 is considered in conservative circles as a wanton disregard of public trust. In some circles it is interpreted as a deliberate omission so that the phony play could continue another 2 years.

The continual concentration of political favors on the city of Juneau has proven obnoxious to citizens of many other communities. The increased salaries and new positions on the pay rolls give impetus to the charge that the Democrats are more inter-

ested in themselves and their feast at the public trough than they are in the people they are supposed to serve.

The pattern indicates that the place of the Republican Party in Alaska is substantial. The trend in recent developments will bring a spontaneous move among the citizens to throw out the Democrats who are so lacking in stewardship.

The Democrats, who have claimed that the Republican Party is dead, are breathing new life and vigor into the old elephant. Alaskans may soon view it as their savior.

[From the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner of June 17, 1949]

#### WORST IN HISTORY

The Associated Press has reported from Juneau that the Territory's general fund was \$879,032 short of funds to meet governmental operating expenses at the end of May.

On May 31, when the books were closed, Treasurer Roden had \$167,497 in cash on hand. Unpaid vouchers against this sum had reached the staggering total of \$1,046,530.

The net deficit is unquestionably the worst in the Territory's history.

Gross tax collections for the first 5 months of this year were \$2,324,915, of which \$353,858 was paid into earmarked funds, therefore, becoming unavailable for corporate purposes. Thus the balance collected for operating expenses for the first 5 months of 1949 was only \$1,971,057.

A projection of these figures indicates tax collections of approximately \$12,000,000 in the next 2 years against \$21,000,000 in appropriations for the period, including expenditures from the gasoline tax fund.

The first results of this frightening situation are already apparent.

A dispatch from Juneau yesterday told that \$1,774,063 in school-construction funds have been "frozen" by the Territorial board of administration because of the precariousness of the present finances.

These funds, of course, are not to be confused with those raised by incorporated school districts for their own respective school-construction purposes. Funds for the new Fairbanks school raised in this district by a bond issue are not affected by the order.

But it is fortunate that the schools are not now in operation, else the Territory and the communities throughout Alaska would be faced also with the impossible task of meeting teachers' salaries out of the empty treasury. These and other problems incident to the continued operation of the government of Alaska are certain to multiply in the approaching months.

Further comment on the achievements thus far of the overwhelmingly Democratic administration in Juneau under Governor Gruening seems unnecessary at this time.

The decision to halt the proposed expenditures for school construction may have been a logical first step in bringing some order out of the present chaos. We now await with interest the dispatch from the capital which tells of a cut in pay rolls and reduction of other expenses necessary to restore soundness to the Territory's finances.

[From the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner of June 21, 1949]

#### FIVE MILLION DOLLARS FROZEN IN ALASKA—TREASURY DEFICIT BLAMED—TERRITORIAL BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION REVEALS ACTION

JUNEAU, June 21.—The Territorial board of administration today froze \$5,645,493 in spending for the Alaska government for the next biennium as a result of the financial crisis facing the Gruening administration.

Included in the frozen funds is \$900,000 for new construction at the University of Alaska.

## ORDERED SUSPENDED

The biggest single loser was the Territorial veterans administration. A \$1,200,000 loan to the veterans revolving fund was ordered suspended by the board.

The projected new Territorial administration building to cost \$660,000 was also blocked by the order.

The \$75,000 National Guard appropriation was slashed temporarily to \$10,000.

## SALARIES NOT AFFECTED

These and the other frozen funds were appropriated by the last session of the legislature.

The official announcement specified that Territorial salaries, relief funds, and school-maintenance expenditures are not affected by the Board's action.

The total of suspended appropriations includes \$1,774,063 for school construction already announced as frozen last week.

Following are the funds and the purposes for which they were intended included in today's order:

Alaska Housing Authority, to establish housing program, \$250,000.

Reimbursement to school boards, for interest paid on money borrowed in 1947-49 biennium, \$10,000.

Loan to Territorial veterans' revolving fund, \$1,200,000.

Community hospital construction, \$250,000. Territorial employees' retirement system, \$20,000.

Pioneer home, for purchase and remodeling of adjacent property (total appropriation, \$50,000), \$20,000.

Rural school construction, \$1,024,063.

Construction and repairs, incorporated school districts, \$750,000.

Fisheries commission (total appropriation, \$250,000), \$180,000.

Bus transportation commission, \$2,500.

Financial assistance to hospitals, \$50,000. Territorial building, \$660,000.

To establish Alaska library board, \$2,000.

Statehood commission, \$80,000.

National Guard (total appropriation, \$75,000), \$65,000.

Community fairs, \$20,000.

Pure Food and Drug Act, \$10,000.

Purchase of typewriters, \$3,500.

New construction, University of Alaska, \$900,000.

Vocational rehabilitation, \$20,000.

Expenses of superintendents, advisory commission, commissioner of education, \$2,000.

Department of mines construction of field offices, \$100,000.

Hospital survey and construction supervision, \$15,000.

Professional boards, including optometry, pharmacy, medical examiners, cosmetology, chiropractic examiners, dental examiners, basic sciences, \$11,435.

## ACTION WAS SWIFT

The \$5,645,498 total which has now been frozen amounts to almost one-third of the legislature's total appropriations.

Board action followed swiftly upon disclosures last week that the Territory was \$879,032 short of meeting its current obligations at the end of May. Cash on hand at the opening of business on June 1 was reported as \$167,497 against which there were unpaid vouchers aggregating \$1,046,530.

Records show this to be the worst deficit in Territorial history.

## BELOW NECESSARY SUM

Gross tax collections for the first 5 months were \$2,324,915 of which \$353,858 was paid into earmarked funds, leaving \$1,971,057 to meet current obligations, far below the sum necessary to pay the Territory's unprecedented expenses for the period.

In addition to the treasury deficit in the face of outstanding warrants, the Territory's financial pinch has been accentuated by court challenges of three major tax measures enacted by the legislature to meet the

burden of the record-breaking appropriations. They are suits testing the validity of the new income-tax law, the quadrupled fish-trap tax, and the nonresident fishing-license levy.

Two years ago, when a similar crisis confronted the Gruening administration, the board of administration froze projected expenditures amounting to \$1,038,000.

## NEED FOR ECONOMY IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make an insertion in the body of the RECORD, and to make a brief statement, which will take not more than 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. KEM. Recently the Joplin Globe, Joplin, Mo., one of the leading newspapers in our State, published a thoughtful statement made by the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] concerning proposed expenditures, with emphasis upon the need for drastic economy in the Federal Government. This newspaper printed eight proposals involving the expenditure of additional money. At the side of each two boxes were placed in which the reader might indicate a position for or against the proposal.

Certain readers of the Joplin Globe clipped these eight questions from the newspaper, and after marking their answers, sent them to me. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD immediately following my remarks the eight questions and a tabulation made in my office of the replies received.

Every time our people have an opportunity they seem to indicate clearly that they want relief from the tremendous burden of wartime taxation they are being called upon to bear. To do this we must first reduce the cost of Government. President Truman has proposed a budget to Congress of approximately \$42,000,000,000, the largest in our peacetime history. The President has further disclosed that the receipts of the Government are now falling below expenditures. As has been frequently said, there are three alternatives before us: First, to slide into deficit financing, which means insolvency; second, to increase taxes; or, third, to reduce the expenditures of the Government.

I hope very much that the Congress—at long last—will decide upon the third course of action as the only sound course under all the circumstances.

I am offering this as a bit of reliable evidence of how our people themselves are thinking.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	No answer	For	Against
A straight 10-percent cut in all Federal expenditures that can be cut?.....	0	189	15
Secretary of Agriculture Brannan's farm plan, the cost of which Secretary Brannan himself is unable to estimate. (Senator Byrd did not estimate the cost, but others have suggested figures up to \$10,000,000,000 a year for this subsidy.).....	1	7	196

	No answer	For	Against
The so-called national health plan? (This calls for increased payroll taxes. Senator Byrd, referring to it as "socialized medicine," estimated a \$10,000,000,000 annual cost.).....	1	11	192
The Federal housing program recently enacted by the Senate? (The cost of the low-rent feature alone amounts to a possible \$20,000,000,000 over 40 years, according to Senator Byrd, even if it is not later expanded.).....	0	10	194
Federal aid to education, costing \$300,000,000 the first year? (Senator Byrd doesn't believe the cost would ever be that low again.).....	1	32	171
The ECA program, costing 5½ billion dollars for the coming year? (This is chiefly aid to Europe under the so-called Marshall plan.).....	1	45	158
Arms for the North Atlantic Pact, to cost something over \$1,000,000,000 in the coming year? (Mr. Byrd thinks that estimate is too low.).....	1	46	157
Increased income and payroll taxes that Senator Byrd says will be necessary to carry out the President's many recommendations for more spending?.....	0	9	195

## THE STRIKE IN HAWAII

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as the crisis in Hawaii grows more acute I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a very informative letter which has been received by a mother of a present resident of Hawaii. This letter strengthens my belief that arbitration is the answer to the Hawaiian dispute. It deepens my conviction that the employers are making a great mistake in refusing to arbitrate the dispute. It strengthens my view that refusal to arbitrate plays right into the hands of the leftist philosophy of Bridges. Those who think that arbitration of this dispute amounts to yielding to Bridges are mistaken. A refusal to arbitrate this dispute, in my opinion, is likely to strengthen the claim of Bridges that a concerted drive is being made to break the union. I think the employers are following a very radical course of action in refusing to submit the merits of their case to arbitration. I repudiate the radicalism of the employers as well as the leftism of Bridges. Again I suggest to the President that he ask both sides in this dispute to submit their evidence in support of their contentions on the merits of the dispute to an arbitration board whose decision should be accepted as final and binding.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 23, 1949.

Mrs. OTTANIO CONTI,  
Gettysburg, Pa.

MOTHER: According to tonight's Star-Bulletin, the New York Times, the Washington Post, and the Washington Evening Star today printed a 2-page advertisement about the strike here in Hawaii. Sunday past the Honolulu Advertiser ran that ad locally and asked for donations for it to [be] published in D. C. newspapers. I for one did not and will not contribute to anything so misleading



as was that ad. Nowhere in the ad was there any inkling to the issues at stake in the strike. The Honolulu Advertiser is in the same category as the Chicago Tribune, the New York News, and the Washington Times-Herald. The strike is bad enough, but the Advertiser has made it worse by purposely injecting hate, fear, hysteria, and misrepresentations into a situation already involved in irrelevant issues. Let's get a few things straight first. Hawaii is not being starved out. The only serious food shortage we have—and it is most serious indeed—is in evaporated milk for babies. The armed forces here have been generous in giving some of their supply to the civilian population and the Navy is bringing in small quantities of it so that if it is reserved for infants only, Hawaii can get by. Large quantities of food are now coming in via parcel post, believe it or not! Potatoes, dried fish, oranges, eggs, onions, animal feed, rice, garlic, etc., have come in through the mails in quantity sufficient to give some relief from canned and local foods. The situation however is much more serious business-wise. Unemployment is very high and the welfare rolls are climbing. Businesses are laying off people and cutting wages. Wholesalers bringing in food through the mails are adding 20 percent not only to the cost of the food but to the high parcel-post charges, too! For all their talk that they are fighting [the] people's battle, they still demand their usual (or should I say unusual) profits. But the union is no better. Food is rotting on ships strikebound in Honolulu harbor because the union won't unload any ships that sailed for Honolulu after April 30.

Now to return to the issues of the strike. The union is asking for a 32-cents-an-hour increase and wants to have arbitration accepted as a means of settling labor troubles. The employers first offered an 8-cent increase, raising it to 12 cents a few minutes before the strike began, but have now withdrawn any offer of an increase; in addition the employers don't want arbitration as a method of settling labor disputes. The union supports its case by saying that stevedores working the same cargoes on the same ships in San Francisco and for virtually the [same] employers receive 42 cents an hour more than Hawaii's longshoremen. They hold, also, that the same employers have accepted the principle of arbitration on the west coast and therefore should accept it here.

The employers say that Hawaii's stevedores are paid as well as any other group in Hawaii doing work requiring the same degree of skill and education and that because of a business recession affecting Hawaii now, no increase in wages is justifiable. The employers argue, also, that arbitration has not worked on the west coast and is not a fair means of settling labor disputes. The union, the employers, and the Honolulu Advertiser have all been careless in flinging insults, names, and mud. Charges (true or untrue, I don't know, but at least not yet substantiated) of communism, union-busting, business-busting, and misled aliens (many of the longshoremen are of Philippine nationality) have flown freely. Both sides have rejected several very reasonable plans to end the strike; both sides call each other liars, two-faced, and sneaky.

Except for the sugar and pineapple plantation workers and the longshoremen, there are virtually no labor unions in the Islands. Five big business firms largely control the economy here; not to mention the press (including the Honolulu Advertiser) and some of the radio outlets. With a very few exceptions, wages are about the same or lower than on the west coast; but prices are much higher. The Federal Government pays its classified civil-service workers here a 25 percent cost-of-living difference because last fall the Bureau of Labor Statistics found that it cost that much more to live here than in Wash-

ington, D. C. Not exactly a cheap place is D. C., you know. For further proof I offer that except for food, I buy most of my things from the west coast, pay parcel post and get them here for from 10 percent to 40 percent cheaper than I can buy the same articles in Honolulu. Also, I want to point out that the so-called "misled aliens" are Filipinos, brought here by the Big Five firms themselves to work on the plantations but who found instead that wages on the plantations were much too low for the cost-of-living here and have gone to stevedoring (average wage on the sugar plantations now is 82½ cents an hour if it doesn't rain—could you and Dad live on less than \$40 weekly, before deductions, even in Gettysburg?)

The employers are not the only ones in the wrong. The union is as bad. Their strike has put thousands out of work and has wrecked many small businessmen. It has damaged our tourist trade—which the Islands need badly—and has struck nonfreight carrying vessels. It has shown little regard for their fellow laboring man and for the public and many of its actions cannot be defended. I firmly believe that there is little doubt but that the union was most unwise in having a strike when the economy and the business of the Islands were suffering from a series of bad blows such as tremendous cuts in military spending here, the general recession all over the country, and the west coast longshoremen strike of last fall. The public is generally opposed to the union, and particularly when we have a large labor surplus.

The Honolulu Advertiser and the Big Five have appealed to the President and Congress for help and then condemn both the President and the Congress because they feel that they do not have sufficient power to break the strike. I only wish that I had sent you copies of local editorials criticizing the President when he has asked for certain powers and for certain programs during last fall and winter.

You know, Mother, as I reread what I have just written, I believe you would do me a great favor if you and/or Dad sent this letter to the Washington Post so that those who read the Letters to the Editor can get some information from Hawaii concerning our strike, rather than letters or ads from each side vilifying the other. Hawaii needs ships—to bring us food and manufactured goods from the mainland and to take our sugar and pineapples to their markets.

Your son,

#### EMPLOYMENT OF PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED PERSONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on the subject of an essay contest relating to employment of physically handicapped persons.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this statement be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY ON ESSAY CONTEST

Mr. President, yesterday, July 6, 1949, the Senate passed House Joint Resolution 228, authorizing an appropriation for the President's Committee on National Employment of the Physically Handicapped Week. On page 8927 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may be found a brief description of this fine measure.

Coincidentally enough, just this morning I received an important letter from Mr. A. L. Beier, secretary of the Governor's committee for the State of Wisconsin on employment of the physically handicapped. Mr. Beier sent to me four winning essays in a contest sponsored recently by the Governor's com-

mittee and the President's committee. This contest is on the theme, Why Not Hire the Handicapped?

#### WISCONSIN ESSAY WINNER

High school youngsters in the eleventh or twelfth grades of any public or private high school in the United States are eligible to compete in the national contest. The winner for the State of Wisconsin is young Miss Patricia A. Theisen, age 17, of Cassville, Wis. Her parents, Mr. and Mrs. A. J. Theisen, are farmers. Patricia's essay, which was judged best by the State judges, will now be submitted for the national competition.

The second prize winner is Phyllis Indermuehle, age 18, of West Bend, Wis. The third prize winner for Wisconsin is Dorothy Ottow, of Madison, and the fourth prize winner was Shirley J. Smith, age 18, of Waukesha.

Funds for the prizes were given by the Wisconsin Independent Theater Owners Association, Mr. John Adler, president, of Marshfield, and by the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor, George Haberman, president, of Milwaukee.

I am happy to invite attention to the three judges of the contest for the Badger State. They are R. W. Fleming, Madison, director, University of Wisconsin Industrial Relations Center; C. L. Greiber, Madison, director, State Board of Vocational and Adult Education; Voyta Wrabetz, Madison, chairman, Industrial Commission of Wisconsin.

I cannot say how strongly I feel that a wonderful contest like this should receive the encouragement of the Congress and of leaders in our country in every walk of life.

Through the years in the Congress, it has been my pleasure to work on behalf of the disabled in our population. I have appeared before Senate and House Appropriations Committees for adequate funds to rehabilitate the physically handicapped. I have spoken on the floor of the Senate on the needs of disabled veterans and have introduced bills to aid them.

#### HELPING THE HANDICAPPED

To me, there are few more rewarding tasks in this world than to make a disabled person whole, to make a disabled person adequate, to earn his or her own way insofar as possible. What joy we can bring to their hearts. What pleasure we can give to the bedridden, to those who are broken in health, who still retain, however, active, alert, intelligent minds, eager to make a contribution to their country.

If we do not help them to help themselves, if we do not rehabilitate them, they are a liability to themselves, to their family, to their country. If on the other hand we encourage them, train them, reeducate them, they prove to be great assets—adaptable, productive, reliable workers. American industry has found that out. Our Government has found it out, too in the splendid employment record of handicapped workers during the war.

A physically handicapped citizen is defined as anyone who, because of congenital deformity, injury or disease, is substantially handicapped in obtaining employment or self-employment. These include people with amputations, blind folks, folks who have unfortunately lost their hearing in part or in whole, youngsters and adults with organic heart disease, arrested tuberculosis patients, arthritic victims, folks with special defects, epilepsy, and other disabilities.

Let us note that in addition to those folks born handicapped there are those who suffered some accident or war injury or illness which has made it impossible for them to gain employment unless they receive the benefit of special training.

Opportunity for these handicapped folks is not only sound on a humanitarian basis. It is just plain good economics.

## UNITY ON THIS ISSUE

I am glad to say that here is one issue on which labor and management are fully united. Here is an issue on which there has been magnificent cooperation between the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the President's committee, State committees, and the United States Department of Labor.

We will be looking forward to announcement of the final essay winners for the Nation. The first prize essay in each State and Territory is being shipped to Washington, where it will be judged. National prizes of \$1,000, \$400, \$300, \$200, and \$100 will be awarded, respectively, for the first to fifth essays. The Disabled American Veterans organization will pay expenses of the national winners to Washington, D. C. These national winners will be announced during National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week from October 2 to 8.

I want to congratulate all of those folks, including the three national judges, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin, and United States Commissioner of Education Earl J. McGrath, to congratulate the International Association of Machinists, and all the other labor unions which have cooperated, to congratulate all the State officials, and all the private citizens, who have worked on this 1,200-word contest.

Good luck and Godspeed.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the winning prize essay for Wisconsin be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

## WHY NOT HIRE THE HANDICAPPED?

(First prize essay by Patricia A. Theisen, Cassville (Wis.) High School; sponsored by Governor's Committee on the Employment of the Physically Handicapped)

I am a voice, a loud, heavy voice that is sure and firm; a high, shrill voice that wavers unsteadily. I am the composite voice of men, women, and children. My tones resound and echo from the depths of despair and discouragement. They rise to form a dome of hope. I am the voice of the handicapped. Do not turn away but listen while I speak through your heart.

You know me. Everyone knows me at one time or another for directly, or indirectly, I touch every life. I am the GI Joe who left a leg at Iwo Jima. I am the man next door. Just this spring I broke my back. The doctors say I'll never walk again. I looked for a job but no one will hire a cripple. I am the blind. I am the deaf. I am a little child born crippled. What does the future hold for me? What does the future hold for anyone who is handicapped?

Once upon a time, not so very many years ago, a great man wrote, "All men are created equal." This is the theme of democracy. It is the blueprint America is built from. It is the creed we were taught to believe. And I try to believe—but you won't let me because you yourself do not feel it in your heart.

You give me pennies, nickels; yes, even dollars if I stand along a street corner with a cup. Then you pat yourself on the back and pass on. You forget me. But that is not enough. I need more than money. If I am to survive and not lose heart, you must accept me as one of you; man to man.

In our modern world, men must work for a living. Each quart of milk, each loaf of bread, each mouthful vital to existence must be bought and paid for with human toil. I can work. I am quick, deft, skilled, efficient. I have learned to develop the well parts of my body to such an extent that I can excel the average individual when I work with them. And yet I cannot capitalize on this.

Men turn to my deformed body with pity on their faces. Pity that causes me to cringe and draw away with a nausea in my stomach and a thorn of vengeance in my brain. I do not pity myself. I do not want pity. I am no different than you are in many ways. There are restrictions and limitations placed upon me but they need not be emphasized. If properly regarded they are of little consequence in hindering my progress in life. For man is a many-sided figure. His scopes are varied and innumerable. If one or two are closed to him, his life need not be extinguished; only directed to different channels.

And what my body lacks, my soul compensates. Suffering and forsaken, I have turned to God. The light from the Lord ripens a soul and matures it. If He will let me work for Him, cannot you, who are mortals like myself, give me a chance?

One of us led you through a world war. You placed your faith in him and he did not fail you. I do not rest on his laurels, nor do I wish to. I only want a fair chance to earn my own.

Today my sky is gray and screened in with clouds. The sunshine lies just beyond. And, yet, I cannot penetrate my prison alone. You on the outside must petition for me. Meet me half way. I ask no more. I expect no less.

Yes, I am a voice. A sad voice. I hold no childish laughter, no old man's chuckle. But I hold hope and I still hold faith. And this is my plea that you can help fulfill, "Welcome me as a fellow countryman. Give me a job. Let me work, and I'll be able to believe once more that all men are created equal."

## THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

The Senate as in Committee of the Whole resumed the consideration of the treaty, Executive L (81st Cong., 1st sess.), signed at Washington on April 4, 1949.

MR. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate on the subject of the North Atlantic Pact. I ask permission to stand in the well and turn my right side—not my back—toward the Chair, and face this body.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator looks well and sounds well from any direction.

If agreeable to the Senate, the Chair will advise Senators that, in view of the arrangement, Senators who wish to address their colleagues face to face may do so without having to obtain individual consent. The Chair hears no objection.

MR. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I rise to address myself to the subject before us, the ratification of the North Atlantic Pact.

Let me say at once that it is a matter of deep conviction with me that the responsibilities recognized by this pact are responsibilities which we should not seek to escape and which indeed we cannot escape. It is a matter of paramount concern to us that the world is once more and all too quickly faced with the necessity for restraining the expansion of a predatory power whose ambitions and purposes know no bounds. In rapid succession that power conquered tiny Finland; subdued Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, and destroyed their independence; joined with that other international gangster, Hitler, in seizing half of Poland; then having fallen out with its partner, as is the habit with gangsters, seized the rest of Poland; then in rapid order overran the Balkan countries,

Hungary, and finally Czechoslovakia. In this area of eastern Europe only Greece and Turkey have been saved from conquest, and these only by assistance from us which has run into billions of dollars.

For the present, a term has been put to that seemingly irresistible wave of conquest, but the purpose and power still remain. The pressure is continuous, night and day, except as the free nations of the world resist it or, better yet, find means of lightening the pressure. That wave of conquest will continue to roll until it has swept Europe and Asia into subjugation.

Nor are Africa and the Americas safe. Remembering what we oftentimes forget, that the battlefields of this conquest are in the mind and spirit of man, rather than on the earth's surface, we can be assured that Africa and the Americas will follow the capitulation of Europe and Asia. Should we succeed in maintaining our independence, we will yet be a beleaguered garrison, sailing the seas and visiting the ports of the world only at the arbitrary permission of a power far stronger than ourselves.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that I have put too strongly the ultimate results of complacency and resulting inaction on our part. We truly face a prospect more menacing than any which has faced any country or any civilization in the past. It is no more than the prattle of thoughtless children to suggest that we play in our own backyard and take no thought and accept no responsibility for what the neighbors are doing.

With this expression of fundamental concern in the purposes of the pact which is before us, let me turn to a consideration of some of the problems which it presents.

Senators have been very much concerned as to whether in ratifying it we are automatically committing ourselves to war in the event of attack by an enemy power on one of our cosignatories. Mr. President, it will not take 4 minutes to convince any reasonable person that we are morally committed to a declaration of war in such a case. Not even 4 hours of the most brilliant and convincing oratory could shake this belief in the mind of any reasonable person.

Suppose, for instance, that what was momentarily feared not so many months ago took place and Norway was invaded by Russian forces. Does anyone believe that when, as, and if that does take place, there will be the slightest doubt in the mind of anyone in this room that the Norwegians would expect us to come to their aid in the shortest possible time and with the greatest possible measure of assistance? It is fantastic that, having signed the pact, we should hesitate to do so.

But as was pointed out yesterday by the senior Senator from Michigan, something more than a moral responsibility is involved. There is involved the question of our own national safety, and ultimately of our national existence. Remembering that Russia is strong in submarines; that she had, immediately on the conclusion of the war, the advantages of the latest techniques of the Germans



in submarine construction and submarine warfare; remembering further that the coast of Norway is ideally fitted to be a naturally protected base for these long-range carriers of death and destruction—remembering all this, who can doubt that national safety would be laid alongside national honor in the balances, and that the weight of the decision would be heavily and instantly toward a declaration of war.

Mr. President, we are quibbling when we question this moral obligation. It is there. It will be accepted, not merely for its own sake, but for its intimate connection with national interests of safety and survival.

In spite of all this, Mr. President, the presentation of the pact arouses serious doubts in my mind, or to put it more accurately, brings to a focus doubts which have long disturbed me.

I approach this pact with deep forebodings, of which the first is a conviction that it marks one more step toward the pyramiding of a load of national expenditures which we shall ultimately find it impossible to bear. We have moved toward our unbearable budget step after step. First there were the minor commitments set up by the institutions agreed upon at Bretton Woods. Then came the Truman doctrine with its expenditures for Greece and Turkey. Next in order, and with a measurable degree of successful achievement, came the European recovery program. Last in our fiscal retrogression to date has come the proliferation of our own military expenditures. Now comes this military responsibility for the North Atlantic area, whose costs can be diffidently and gently presented so far as immediate responsibilities are concerned, but whose final end we properly suspect to be beyond the limits of present imagination.

The politburo has set out to ruin us economically. The politburo has victory within its grasp. It is at this moment running our country. It determines our policy, not merely in the foreign field, but in the domestic field. By imposing fiscal limitations, it compels us either to forego constructive and useful expenditures for our own people or alternatively, and more probably, to rush into deficit financing during periods of high production and employment.

Mr. President, the politburo wins. The battlefield is not where the North Atlantic Pact conceives it to be. We have misjudged the position of the enemy and have subjected ourselves to a deadly flank attack of which we seem to be almost blissfully unaware.

In building up military strength and financing the building up of that strength by our associates in this pact, we must reckon on the ability of the Russians to match us over and over again, so far as personnel is concerned, at a fraction of the expense to which we shall be put in carrying out our own preparations. Russia does not need money to build armies. She has at her command the scantily requited labor of teeming millions of men and women. She has no budgetary limitations. She deals, not with dollars or with rubles, but with limitless man-hours.

We have our own resources with which Russia cannot compete. We have a matchless productivity of the arms and munitions of war. We have a matchless technical skill not merely in their design and production but in their use. We have an individual resourcefulness in our citizens whether under arms or behind the front which cannot be matched by any potential enemy. We can bring these matchless resources into organized preparation without crippling ourselves economically, but that is a matter of defense policy and the defense budget which need not be gone into here and now. The point I am making is simply that we must not allow ourselves to be drawn into this budgetary ambush which Joseph Stalin and his associates have set for our destruction. The implications of the North Atlantic Pact can easily lead us and our associates who support it into a fatal enfilade.

There is another way in which we are fighting our prospective enemy where he is not instead of where he is. His secondary line of attack has just been described. That enemy attacks the fiscal stability of the nations it would destroy; but its primary battlefield, as everyone surely should know by this time, is in the minds and souls of men. The final battles must be won there and not on any geographical terrain, for against this psychological battle physical armaments and munitions offer no defense.

Mr. President, I feel we have gone crazy on physical defense which after all, for a nation which has no territorial ambitions, no deep-laid plots for imperialistic expansion, is defense pure and simple. Our puny expeditions into the psychological field have tended to be foolishly confined again to the defensive. We have hunted out Communists in this country and brought them before the courts. We have sought to follow the windings and twistings of the Communist underground. Why so fearfully on the defensive? Why not openly, courageously and proudly on the offense in this chosen battlefield of the new predatory menace to the people of the world?

It is true we have had some success in this psychological warfare. To date, our most successful venture has been the European recovery program. This has saved for us Italy and France, which had been marked for conquest by the masters of communism. The cost has been high, but success has been attained. It was a success which no possible expenditures for physical arms and munitions could conceivably have accomplished. It was successful because it was fought on the enemy's battlefield, where his forces were deployed. It was a contest for the minds and wills of men. That is where the main battles of communism are being fought.

The success has been great, but not all problems have been solved. Economic difficulties are inherent in the endeavor, but let us give credit to the undertaking for the greatest advances we have yet won in this cold war.

Let me touch on another of our meager, puny, timid, pusillanimous undertakings to meet the enemy on the battlefield where he is deployed. I refer

to the Voice of America. It was an unob-servant and misinformed Senate which refused to restore the amount which had been cut from the budget appropriation for this undertaking. It is not easy for us to know just how effective these programs are. We judge that they must be effective when we observe the frantic efforts of the Russian Government to jam the air waves while the Paris conference was in session. The enemy thinks better of this undertaking than does the Senate of the United States. Which is right? I for one, Mr. President, am betting on the enemy. Billions upon billions upon billions of dollars for arms and armaments, quibbling and haggling over a few million dollars for meeting the enemy on his own battlefield. Mr. President, it does not make sense.

My doubts and dissatisfactions are, however, much broader than those I have just expressed with reference to the actions of this body. The State Department, the whole administration, as well as the legislative branch of the Government needs to knock its head against a hard stone wall of recognition of the facts of life with relation to this cold contest in which we are engaged. Primary rather than incidental thought should be given to reaching the minds and souls of the people in Russia and in the satellite countries. With one-tenth the money we are spending on arms and an equal amount of thought, ingenuity, experimentation and enterprise applied to the psychological and spiritual approach to the peoples behind the curtain—with this minimum expenditure of money and maximum expenditure of intelligence the war is won. The answer, Mr. President, lies here. This is the victorious offensive. The Atlantic Pact painfully and expensively holds the physical ground while we make our attack on spiritual territory.

It is spiritual territory on which the battle must be won. We must approach the deluded subjects of the enemy, not with deceit but with truth. We have a common cause. We must destroy a common enemy. Not a scintilla of hatred is in our minds or our souls against the deluded and exploited peoples who live under the poisonous shadow of the Politburo. It is our main concern to get this word to them. It is our main concern to make them allies in our common cause.

I now come, Mr. President, to consider the final one of the doubts which have been raised in my mind by the presentation of the Atlantic Pact. No amount of oratory can convince me that the fragile cord of article 51, which ties this undertaking to the United Nations, is a tie of strength and support to that organization in which we have placed so much hope and to which we have given so much financial support. Rather than a tie, that connection is a vital vein by which we draw the lifeblood from that great institution whose physical home is being erected on the East Side of the Borough of Manhattan. It matters not how lofty the structures, how resplendent the marble with which they are sheathed. They may easily become a hollow shell and that is what the Atlantic Pact will make of them.

The pact fills a vacuum not contemplated when article 51 was devised. It was not expected that the world's peace would hang suspended on that fragile article instead of being firmly supported on the whole magnificent foundation of the Charter. Mr. President, we are abandoning our hope in that foundation. We are substituting another undertaking. The United Nations is sitting on the sidelines and watching a contest in which it has no part.

Let us read article 51 again. Let me repeat the first sentence: "Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security."

Mr. President, in view of the Pact before us these are feeble words. Let one of the signatory nations be attacked, general total warfare results. Meanwhile, under the terms of article 51, this goes on "until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security."

Poor little Security Council. Mr. President, do you not pity it, whether it be fussily busy around the outskirts of the conflict and at a safe distance from it or, panic-stricken, hides its head deep within the foundations of those lofty structures now rising on the East Side of Manhattan Island?

Mr. President and fellow Senators, these are my doubts and fears. What shall we do about them? I have already indicated my conviction that the State Department and the other branches of the administration and the Legislative Department of our Government must right-about-face and fight the enemy of mankind on his own chosen battlefield of the mind and spirit of man. But that leaves unanswered the question of what we may do to revitalize the hope that the nations of the world have had in the United Nations. I believe there is something we can do there.

This can be done by organizing the cooperative action of the nations who join this pact on the model, under the rules, and in accordance with the ultimate organization envisioned in the UN Charter. Let it become a pilot plant for the United Nations as we had expected it to be. Let its common defense be organized along the lines of the United Nations police force and let our contribution be to such a common force rather than to the strengthening of the individual armies of the individual signatories. Let us provide for a truly common defense. Let us look forward beyond this to the modest and well-chosen beginnings of international law and international justice.

For the present this will be a restricted endeavor confined to an implementation of the Atlantic Pact. If we can be successful in this pilot-plant operation, we can invite the support of other nations who are like-minded with the signatories in a deep-seated and honest desire for peace.

If we proceed on this course, article 51 can become the means of strengthening rather than weakening the United

Nations. The cooperative effort under 51 should become a subsidiary undertaking of the United Nations. The officers and offices should be housed in the structures now arising on the Isle of Manhattan. It should grow in strength and skill until the time comes when no nation can refuse to join with it and meet its terms already developed, already experimentally tested in practical operation. The Atlantic Pact may and must become the protector and builder of the United Nations instead of a parasite sapping its strength.

Mr. President, I have been driven by the considerations I have just outlined to make a very difficult decision. My convictions are so deep on these matters of the success of the Russian attack on our fiscal system, on our failure to meet the Russians on their chosen battlefield—the minds and souls of man—and on this question of building rather than destroying the United Nations, that I am forced to postpone my decision on support of the Atlantic Pact on its own merits. Were assurances given by the legislative and administrative branches of the Government that the true battlefield of this cold war was recognized, were assurances given or means proposed for employing the pact as a means of strengthening instead of weakening the United Nations, then would I cast my vote for the pact with joy and gladness. Until those assurances are made, I must withhold my approval.

Mr. President, this is a personal decision. I cannot expect that many of my fellow Members of the Senate will feel as I do in these matters. I do, however, urge with all the intensity and sincerity of which I am capable that they begin to consider the matters which I have been setting forth, for they have application to other measures which come before us in the weeks ahead and I, for one, am convinced that they must be the determining factors if our internal strength is to be maintained and if our external responsibilities are to be carried out.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has said that his decision is being postponed and that he has not reached a final determination. The Senator has spoken quite fully with reference to psychological warfare, defensive and offensive. Why does not the Senator consider the North Atlantic Pact a very distinct psychological offensive on our part, rather than giving the impression which I received from listening to him that it is rather a defensive matter and not an offensive action on our part, particularly on the psychological side? If he feels that way, would it affect his decision?

Mr. FLANDERS. I would say to the Senator from Massachusetts that that is, of course, one of the considerations which have been in my mind. I do not find many warrants in history for competitive armament—and that is what this is—being a psychological deterrent to warfare. I mentioned in the remarks which I just made the ease and

comparative inexperience with which the Russians can match us on size of armies. It cannot match us on other things, but at very small expense to itself, if we double or triple the force in being, it can go beyond us and never fear.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then the Senator feels that the North Atlantic Pact is merely a question of armaments as regards the other nations signatory to the pact and ourselves, and gives no effect to the psychological side of it without the build-up of armaments. Is that correct?

Mr. FLANDERS. Without the build-up of armaments it has no psychological effect. I feel that the most important psychological effect is in reassurance to our powerful cosignatories, rather than any deterrent effect on the part of the presumed opponent.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. What particular step does the Senator from Vermont feel the State Department could have taken prior to this time to have the matter taken care of under the United Nations? Because of Russia's attitude, does he not find trouble with the situation as the United Nations is now operating? It would have been impossible to accomplish the results sought to be attained by the pact through the United Nations. The only way to proceed was under article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

Mr. FLANDERS. I agree with the Senator from Michigan that it has been impossible to operate under the Charter of the United Nations in the face of the fundamental attitude and the resulting successive vetoes of Russia and her group of satellites. I am not sure that anything more could have been done there. I was addressing myself to the possibility of so changing the proposals in the pact, or so adjusting the implementation of the pact, as to use this group of signatories as a pilot plant for the operation of the United Nations as we would like it to be. It was at that point that I was criticizing the State Department.

Mr. FERGUSON. I realize the feeling of the Senator in regard to strengthening the United Nations, and I share his views, because I have discussed the subject with him and we have joined in resolutions attempting to have the Senate speak upon this important problem. But at this time with the United Nations as it is framed, on the principles on which, to a great extent, we desired it to be framed, and finding that Russia has a different use of the United Nations, namely to frustrate action and also to use it as a propaganda agency, do we not find ourselves in a position in which we must tell the world where we stand on the question of aggression? Furthermore, is it not true that the only way we can do it openly is to have an Atlantic pact so that the world may know where we stand on the question in the particular territory affected, as we did in 1823 when it was announced in this room, through the Monroe Doctrine, what our stand was to be in South America and Central America?



Mr. FLANDERS. I remind the Senator that that purpose has already been carried out in the Truman doctrine with reference to Greece and Turkey. But it did not sink in deep enough.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Massachusetts inquired of the Senator from Vermont whether he did not feel that the psychological fact of our signing the Atlantic Pact and affiliating ourselves with it was a highly effective weapon in this cold war. Before asking the Senator my question, I wish to commend him for having so forcefully and emphatically called attention to our great American weakness of spending vast quantities of our substance in military armament, and participating in a most parsimonious manner from the standpoint of implementing the cold war with the ideas which we need in fighting such a war. I know the Senator has expressed himself many times to the effect that the place to fight a cold war is in the minds and the hearts of men.

I wonder if the Senator will agree with me that one reason why the psychological impact of the Atlantic Pact is not going to be so great as we had hoped it might be is its failure to base itself on sound psychological principles. It calls itself an Atlantic pact, which obviously it is not, because by no wide stretch of the imagination can Italy be included in the Atlantic fraternity of nations. It announces itself as a union of democracies, which by no wide stretch of the imagination can it be, since nobody proclaims Portugal to be a democracy. It relies, consequently, on force, on military might, thereby flying in direct defiance of the lessons of history, which teach that any military alliance to be successful must enroll on its side the predominance of strength, which the Atlantic Pact fails to do.

I wonder if the Senator from Vermont shares with me the feeling that if the Atlantic Pact is to operate successfully it must be so implemented, so revised, and so remodeled as to bring over to our side of the ideological warfare all the areas and all the countries and all the peoples who share our desire to oppose the Communist menace.

Mr. FLANDERS. I think the Senator from South Dakota has made an important point. We must give the pact something else besides the mere threat of force. The Senator from Massachusetts asked if there was not psychological value in the pact in addition to the display of total force. I was reminded a little later of the way in which Mr. Bohlen, of the State Department, a couple of years ago expressed so convincingly the idea that the only thing the Russians were afraid of, the only thing they deferred to, was force. Since that time we have been building up force upon force, and where are the Russians? They are just where they were before. The psychological effect of the force which we have been building up continuously has had no favorable response from them.

Mr. MUNDT and Mr. IVES addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota until he has completed his line of questioning, then I shall yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MUNDT. If we are to make of the Atlantic Pact a genuine psychological phalanx for freedom, does not the Senator of Vermont agree with me that we must then make arrangements to bring to our side the banners of all those who are willing and able to enroll with us in that type of ideological contest?

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator from South Dakota is putting into his own words and in his own way the thesis which I have been supporting, and I thank him.

Mr. MUNDT. That holds equally true whether we are to rely upon psychology or upon military might, does it not?

Mr. FLANDERS. It does.

Mr. MUNDT. It is essential that we bring to our side a predominance of strength. The very weakness of the Atlantic Pact, as I see it, is that it excludes more than it includes of the fraternity of people who wish to oppose communism.

#### APPOINTMENT OF JOHN FOSTER DULLES AS SENATOR FROM NEW YORK

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York thanks the Senator from Vermont for yielding, as the Senator from New York has an important announcement to make, which the Senator from New York feels the Members of the Senate may already know, but which he desires to place in the RECORD. The Governor of New York has within the last hour named JOHN FOSTER DULLES to fill the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of Robert F. Wagner as Senator from New York.

Mr. BALDWIN rose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I was about to yield to the Senator from Connecticut, who had risen, but with his permission I shall yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I cannot resist the immediate temptation to express my high appreciation of the judgment of the distinguished Governor of New York for sending to us as a colleague my very dear personal friend, JOHN FOSTER DULLES. His long association in the active leadership of the spiritual forces of this Nation is the key to his character. His long association with public affairs in intimate work for collective security and world peace is the key to his public attitudes.

We are to associate, Mr. President, with a great mind, a great heart, and a great experience, and I, for one, am happy to embrace this immediate opportunity to express my deep gratitude that the Senate is to enjoy the advantage of the membership of this distinguished American.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont

yield to me to speak a moment on the same subject to which the Senator from Michigan has referred?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I merely wish to say a word, Mr. President, in addition to what my distinguished colleagues from New York [Mr. IVES] and from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] have said. I just heard as I came into the Chamber of the appointment of JOHN FOSTER DULLES to the important post of United States Senator, to be a colleague of ours. I have known Mr. DULLES intimately for possibly 10 or 15 years. I have watched his progress as a lawyer and his career in public life, and I express sincere gratitude that the distinguished Governor of New York has drafted him to serve in the Senate at this critical time in world affairs.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, before yielding to the Senator from Connecticut, I should like first to yield to myself a moment or two to express my entire agreement with the remarks which have been made by the Senators from New York, Michigan, and New Jersey regarding Mr. DULLES. I think the Senate is exceedingly fortunate in this appointment, and I conceive no better one could have been made.

Now, I yield, at long last, to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, first I should like to associate myself with the remarks which have been made regarding the appointment of this distinguished citizen to the United States Senate. He will bring to the Senate a great mind, a great heart, and a great experience in public affairs. We are to be congratulated on the action of the distinguished Governor of the State of New York.

#### THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

The Senate as in Committee of the Whole resumed the consideration of the treaty, Executive L (81st Cong., 1st sess.), signed at Washington on April 4, 1949.

Mr. BALDWIN. Now, Mr. President, I wish to propound a question to the Senator from Vermont. The Senator is aware of the fact, I am sure, that in the pact signed at Rio we have in effect a defensive alliance for the whole Western Hemisphere. In other words, we say in that particular pact that an attack by an aggressor in the Western Hemisphere will invite the cooperation of all the other nations in the Western Hemisphere to come to the defense and the help of the nation attacked, and to repel the attack. The Senator is aware of that situation, I am sure.

Mr. FLANDERS. I am aware of it.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator is also aware of the fact, as he has already said, that in the Atlantic Pact we have very much the same sort of situation embracing the nations bordering upon the Atlantic. Does not the Senator think that that fact in and of itself is of tremendous psychological value in the psychological warfare to capture the minds and souls of men, as he has described it? Does he not feel that those two great pacts are in and of themselves

preeminently capable of a great psychological effect, provided we follow the advice of the distinguished Senator from Vermont in attempting to get this word across to the people of Russia themselves?

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that I made a diligent effort to convince myself of the effectiveness of the psychological values of the Atlantic Pact on the minds of those who have the responsibility of determining the actions of the Russian Government. I found such great difficulty in convincing myself of the psychological value of the pact for anything except the signatories, that after wrestling and struggling and sweating I finally gave up the project. As matters stand at the present moment I have no confidence in any great psychological value in the pact as directed toward the Russian Government.

Mr. BALDWIN. Do not the signatories to these two pacts by the very fact of their signatures indicate that as between the Communist way of life and the free way of life they choose the latter? In other words, they align themselves in their thinking and in their idealism on our side. Is not that of great psychological value?

Mr. FLANDERS. I think perhaps we might write that down on a blank sheet and give it a papal blessing. But I do not think it is particularly important.

Mr. BALDWIN. Is it not of great psychological value that any aggressor or any possible aggressor considering aggression by force of arms—which is what aggression ultimately ripens into, as we have observed the history of the world—would have to make in undertaking military aggression a difficult choice as to when and where and how many of the signatory nations would have to be attacked in an all-out effort to silence the others? Is not that of great psychological effect?

Mr. FLANDERS. That goes back again, of course, to the question as to where the battlefield really lies. My guess is that the Russians will continue to build up their own forces *pari passu* or two times *pari passu* with the force which we begin to marshal in the public view against them, but that they will continue to make their battlefield, because it is so cheap, so effective, in the destruction of our fiscal system and in the capture of the hearts and minds of men. That is my guess, for what it may be worth.

Mr. BALDWIN. I think the Senator from Vermont has made a distinct contribution in his speech today in pointing out where, as he describes it, the battlefield is. I am in complete agreement with him that that is where it is. But I also believe—and does not the Senator from Vermont believe?—that there must be positive action on our part indicating our point of view, and positive action that we may encourage all other nations, as we have already encouraged them in the Rio Pact and in the Atlantic Pact, to indicate where they align themselves and what their point of view is? Must there not be positive action of that kind to be the basis for psychological warfare, so to speak?

Mr. FLANDERS. It certainly should be concomitant with it, and I tried to state in the course of my remarks a means by which it seemed to me the pact might be broadened into a psychological support for peace instead of into the terms of an expanded armed alliance; and it would be in accordance with the suggestions I have made to develop it on the pattern of the United Nations, and invite other like-minded nations into it as it is developed.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator from Vermont said a moment ago that he thought one place where a defect existed in the psychological warfare was among the signatories of the pact. Is it not a fact that that is one of the most important places where we want the effect to be felt? In other words, that is the battlefield in the minds and hearts of those people; it is the battlefield upon which Russia is trying to win in her psychological warfare. Is it not also a fact that when we demonstrate to these people that we align ourselves with them, and that we desire them to align themselves with us, we are fighting a psychological battle right on the battlefield to which the distinguished Senator from Vermont has referred?

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that that is a point which I admit. I only say it is not sufficient.

Mr. BALDWIN. Then, it seems to me that the distinguished Senator is driven back, is he not, to the point where he feels that where the psychological battle must be won is in the hearts and minds of the Russian people? I admit that that is a part of the area, but it seems to me the other part of the area is ever so much more important and ever so much more easily taken over and victory accomplished; and that is in the hearts and the minds of men of the nations which have joined us in these pacts, as well as those of the rest of the world.

Mr. FLANDERS. I do not follow the Senator from Connecticut in believing that that is the most important area in which the hearts and minds of men have to be won.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I desire to ask the distinguished Senator two questions. I am interested primarily in the observations made by the distinguished Senator from Vermont relative to article III of the North Atlantic Pact and also the cost of implementation. My first question is this. If I remember the words of the Senator from Vermont, he said it would not take one with average common sense, or with much common sense, more than about 4 minutes to arrive at the conclusion that article III morally and legally committed us to the implementation of the North Atlantic Pact.

Mr. FLANDERS. The Senator has the spirit, though not the exact words of my remarks.

Mr. WHERRY. In view of that observation, and also in view of the statements made, both by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the distinguished ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Com-

mittee, that the pact is entirely separate from the implementation legislation, I ask the Senator this question: If a Senator should vote for the pact, in the opinion of the Senator from Vermont is that a definite commitment—morally, legally, or otherwise—to support the implementation legislation when it comes before the Senate of the United States?

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that I cannot vote for the pact without accepting, first, the moral commitment to declare war immediately if one of the signatories of the pact is attacked; and, second, to go as far as seems to be necessary and advisable at the time and under the circumstances to implement it with what I suppose will be a second measure presented to us.

Mr. WHERRY. That is, with the force that is necessary forthwith to protect and maintain the security of the signatory nations?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes. I may say that I am more sure on the first point than I am on the second point.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I should like to have the Senator again state. I am sure Members of the Senate will remember the very dramatic way in which the distinguished Senator from Michigan emphasized the remarks of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee—that it was like a traffic signal, "Do not enter." A driver comes to a street and finds a sign which says, "Do not enter." Now, "Do not enter" means a potential here; the psychological effect it would have on the other nations of the world that might become aggressor powers. But no force exists with which to protect. No policeman is standing there. "Do not enter" was the thing—was the potential that was of great significance in signing the pact. To me that is the second part of the consideration relative to article III. Does the Senator feel that "Do not enter" is sufficient, or must we have some sort of implementation? Must we have a man there with a gun? If we vote for the pact, do we commit ourselves to something which requires implementation? Does the Senator see what I mean?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the question I should like to have the Senator answer because I think that is the point upon which many Senators are open-minded. I do not say that they are confused. Senators would like to have the point of view of all who express themselves, especially with regard to article III.

Mr. FLANDERS. It gets back to the question of the psychological value of the pact in the mind of the presumed opponent. As I say, I have been unable to place a high value on the psychological effect on the presumed opponent. I am not at all sure that he might not venture into the forbidden street just the same. I think whatever value it has in his mind will still follow the pattern which Mr. Bohlen developed 2 or 3 years ago, that Russia does respect strength. I think the psychological punch will come from the presumed increase in the military support. With that in mind, I feel that I would probably be compelled



to commit myself to military implementation if I voted for the pact.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, if there is any psychological potential to be derived from signing the pact, it must be accompanied by the force to back it up, if we are to prevent the aggressor from going down the street at the head of which is the sign "Do Not Enter."

Mr. FLANDERS. I think that is the Senator's opinion; and that is my opinion.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not sure whether it is my opinion. I am trying hard to wrestle with the problem. The Senator from Vermont stated that he had wrestled with it. I thought the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] stated yesterday in unequivocal terms that the pact was absolutely separate from the implementation legislation. I certainly understood him to say so. That is his interpretation. I should like to know what the interpretation of the Senator from Vermont is, because of the very forceful statement which he makes. Is there a moral obligation? Can we prevent this man from going down the street without resorting to force of arms? Are the two factors so coupled together that they cannot be separated?

The next thing that will happen will be an appeal for implementation. If we do not vote for implementation, it will be charged that when we voted for the North Atlantic Pact we had in mind something more than an idle gesture. That is the point that bothers me.

Mr. FLANDERS. I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that the real point is, What is in the mind of the man going down the street? That is more important than what is in the mind of the Senator from Nebraska or the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WHERRY. If a man goes down the street and does not stop, what are we going to do about it?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Let the Senator from Vermont answer the question. Suppose the man does not stop. What are we going to do about it, if the potential is gone? If there is anything in the idea of a psychological potential, the very fact that we make the declaration, "Keep off the grass," which was another expression used, is in itself a psychological potential.

What I want to know is whether or not there is any relationship between the pact itself and the implementation of arms. That is the point to which I should like to have the Senator address himself. If the man coming down the street goes past the "Do not enter" sign, have we lost the potential, and is there an obligation then to furnish the arms necessary forthwith to resist, no matter where the aggressive action may take place among the 12 signatory nations?

Mr. FLANDERS. Personally I feel that the obligation is present.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I ask one further question?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator from South Dakota wishes to propound a question along the same line, I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to do so. I have another question on a different subject, which I should like to ask.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand that the Senator from Vermont, and not the Senator from Nebraska, has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Dakota may be permitted to ask a question, and that the Senator from Vermont may be permitted to yield to him without my losing my place, because I should like to ask another question, on an entirely different subject.

Mr. WATKINS. I did not understand that the Senator from Nebraska had the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Utah in the chair). To whom does the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. If I may be permitted to do so, I will yield for a further question from the Senator from Nebraska. Then, since the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] has not yet had a chance, I should like to yield to him. Then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota. That is my program.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I am glad that he has announced his program. I merely wished to afford an opportunity to the Senator from South Dakota to address a question to the Senator from Vermont on the point now at issue. That is why I asked unanimous consent that the Senator from Vermont might yield to the Senator from South Dakota, but we will carry through the program announced by the Senator from Vermont.

The second question I should like to ask is this: In the conclusion of the senior Senator from Michigan yesterday he brought up the argument relative to the financial drain upon this country. He, too, stated that we should cautiously protect our financial stability, because without it we cannot lead anyone. We cannot defend ourselves or anyone else if we lose our financial stability. That is a vital question involved in the decision as to whether or not we are going to implement other countries with arms, not only next year, but in years to come.

As I understood the conclusion of the speech of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, he argued that while implementation is a hazard, yet there is also the hazard of war, the cost of which would be far greater than that of implementation. I am interested in the fiscal policy, as is the Senator from Vermont. What is the answer? We are called upon to continue to appropriate. The Senator mentioned the money which we appropriated for Greece and Turkey, and appropriations for other purposes. I understood the Senator to say that the situation with respect to Russia was unchanged. How far can this country go

financially in continuing such appropriations? What is the answer when we come up against the proposition that total war would cost a great deal more than the implementation legislation might cost? Should we take the chance that by means of implementation of the pact we may avert a future war?

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that earlier in my remarks I addressed myself, by implication, at least, to the question whether or not we might find cheaper ways of waging this war than by placing our entire dependence on the terrifically expensive military method. I do not know whether that is a sufficient answer to the question.

Mr. WHERRY. That is one answer, of course, and it is a good answer. But that is not what I had in mind.

We are continually called upon to make decisions with respect to appropriations. I happen to be a member of the Appropriations Committee. The Atomic Energy Commission comes before the Appropriations Committee and says, "The atomic bomb is what stopped communism cold in Europe. You cannot take one dime from this appropriation. We must make a certain number of bombs. This is the program, and you must give us the last red cent."

Then comes the military appropriations, for three branches. They even argue among themselves. If we propose to take a dime from the Navy we are told that we must give the Navy every cent it asks, and make the reduction somewhere else.

Then comes the Air Corps, which argues, "If we are going to carry bombs and be successful, you must give the Air Corps every dime it wants."

Then the Army comes in and says, "If we are going in to possess the land, we must have men."

When each agency comes before us for appropriations, it says, "Perhaps the cost is high; perhaps this is a terrific budget, but it is better than going to war. It will not cost as much." We remember the time when we voted \$55,000,000,000 for the war without an argument.

I did not mean to take so much time, but I wanted to give the Senator the background. We are confronted with the question of what we should do. Should we continue to finance all the plans which are supposed to win the cold war, or should we get our house in order and get ready for the war which apparently some feel is bound to come sooner or later?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is a good question, if I understand it, and I think I do; and I believe the Senator from Nebraska and I are in accord on the answer.

I yield now to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that I have been very much interested in the illustration of the do-not-enter sign. In the opinion of the Senator from Vermont, what is it that keeps people from going into the part of a highway which is blocked off by a do-not-enter sign which they see? I am speaking now of the average American citizen.

Mr. FLANDERS. I suppose it is a complex of things; it is the way the American citizen has been brought up; a general sense of decency, law, and order, and, in some cases, a background of expectation that he would be nabbed and jugged if he disobeyed the sign.

In making the comparison, we have to write off the innate sense of decency, law, and order. We decapitate that, and leave nothing but the fear of force, in this particular case. So I do not think there is quite a parallel between the two cases.

Mr. WATKINS. In other words, between the average American citizens and, let us say, Joseph Stalin?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes. The parallel is not complete.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not true that the average American—the Senator has referred to the matter in terms of decency, and so forth—has respect for the rights of others, and knows that if he goes into an area that is blocked off by a do-not-enter sign, he will interfere with the rights of others; and he is not thinking primarily of the policeman, because, as a Senator said yesterday, he knows as a matter of fact that there are not policemen at the 10,000 do-not-enter signs in the United States? Is not that what would be in the mind of the average American? In other words, he is thinking of the rights of others, and he respects their rights?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes. I am not sure that he thinks definitely and immediately in those terms every time he sees a do-not-enter sign; but there have been built up in his immediate reactions to those things a habit of thought and a habit of action based on the construction the Senator has just described.

Mr. WATKINS. In other words, he does not have in mind what the average German used to have in mind when he saw a sign, *Verboten*?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. In other words, the psychology is different?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes; the psychology is different. The Russian is lacking in that.

Mr. WATKINS. In other words, the average Russian thinks this treaty means that it will be implemented with force.

Mr. FLANDERS. He either thinks that or he thinks we are bluffing—I do not know which.

Mr. WATKINS. Let me refer to recent history, when the representatives of the various nations met in Washington to sign the North Atlantic Pact. Does the Senator from Vermont recall that the ink was hardly dry on the pact before the representatives of the other countries lined up at the State Department, or whatever the proper place was, to see how much in the way of armaments they could obtain from the United States, to help them carry out their part of the pact?

Mr. FLANDERS. I remember that, and I was not surprised. Neither did I condemn them.

Mr. WATKINS. As a matter of fact, did not that indicate what they thought the pact meant? Was it not their interpretation, and did not their actions in

that respect indicate that they thought it meant that?

Mr. FLANDERS. At least it indicated that there was some faint and vagrant hope in their minds.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator think it was only a faint and vagrant hope, or does the Senator believe they had something more assuring than that?

Mr. FLANDERS. That I cannot answer.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator from Vermont recall the news stories which have been given out to the people? The Secretary of State has said, in effect, that the State Department has made no commitment in regard to arms, except that the State Department has committed itself to the representatives of those countries to the point where the Department would present to the Congress a request for such help. Does the Senator recall that?

Mr. FLANDERS. I think I recall it, now that the Senator from Utah has stimulated my memory.

Mr. WATKINS. I wonder whether the Senator took all that into consideration in arriving at his decision that this pact means exactly what the European people think it means; in other words, that they will get arms, that "mutual help" means help from America, the great provider, when this pact goes into full force and effect.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I agreed to yield to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], next in order.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator for following the program so religiously.

The Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Utah, and other Senators, in discussing the relationship of this pact to subsequent implementation legislation, have been selecting an analogy or example from the field of traffic adventure. It seems to me that perhaps if we were to refer to our earlier experience and were to select our illustration from the period of traffic when the horse and buggy were in vogue, we might arrive at a clearer concept of what we undertake when we ratify this Atlantic Pact. In that connection, I think we could look at the Atlantic Pact as the buggy and the insuring implementation legislation as the horse.

Mr. FLANDERS. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt for a moment, I might reverse the comparison. If the Senator were confident that the pact itself, without its implementation, would be effective, he perhaps would suggest that the pact is the horse and the implementation legislation is the buggy.

Mr. MUNDT. Correct, because I am utterly confident that the pact without some kind of implementation is not going to be sufficient.

I elect to select the buggy for comparison with the pact and the horse for comparison with the implementation legislation. I choose to use them as illustrations in that connection.

Mr. FLANDERS. I suspected as much.

Mr. MUNDT. And I suspect that the Senator from Vermont does, as well.

Having that in mind, I wonder whether the Senator from Vermont would agree

with me that that is a valid illustration to use, and that consequently the pact legislation will not get us very far in the direction in which we want to go, unless and until we hitch it up to some kind of implementation legislation.

Mr. FLANDERS. I am inclined to agree with the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Utah in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. I understand that the leaders of the bipartisan foreign policy have stated that implementation is entirely separate from the pact. The distinguished Senator from Utah has raised a point in my mind. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Vermont about that. It may be that the signatories to the Atlantic Pact—particularly England, for example—may not have expected additional moneys, as was stated, the day their representatives signed the pact here in Washington or the day after that; but perhaps they will take the position that England already has taken. In other words, they will not ask for additional steps or implementation, but they will continue to cut down their appropriations for their own defenses, relying upon the United States and the American taxpayer to continue to increase the United States' expenses for its Army, Navy, and Air Corps. That is what England is doing now. Could that be another possible indirect method of implementation, without a direct appropriation to those countries?

Mr. FLANDERS. I can conceive that it could be, but I am not sufficiently prescient to know just what the English are thinking about in that connection or what they are going to do about it. So I leave the Senator's suggestions hanging on his own responsibility.

Mr. JENNER. Let me ask the distinguished Senator this question: Does the Senator from Vermont know that England is drastically reducing the expenditures for her navy?

Mr. FLANDERS. I believe that to be the case.

Mr. JENNER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Vermont another question relating to the point raised by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], I believe, of the psychological effect of the North Atlantic Pact without implementation. I want to ask the distinguished Senator from Vermont whether, when we speak of psychology, it is not a fact that we have a traditional American policy known as the Monroe Doctrine, which has worked effectively in the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. FLANDERS. We have that policy. It has worked effectively. Its implementation in the early years was largely a matter of the presence and active potential support of the English Navy.

Mr. JENNER. Then does the Senator presume that England is relying upon that same psychological force in reverse; in other words that she will cut down her defense expenditures, relying upon the American taxpayer continually to



spend more money each year for defense, and that therefore we shall have a Navy that will look after England's interests all over the world?

Mr. FLANDERS. That is a very attractive proposition. Whether it is true or not I do not know.

Mr. JENNER. Then I should like to ask the distinguished Senator one further question. If the basic premise and the great aid for future peace of the world is the psychological effect of the Atlantic Pact, the theory of "Keep off the grass," I should like to ask if we, as a nation, have at last determined that the future peace of the world and of our own security lies in the heart of Europe, some place on the Rhine or the Elbe, why could we not have extended the traditional American policy known as the Monroe Doctrine to that very spot in Europe where we have determined that our future peace and security lie, and have the same psychological effect as we would obtain by signing with 11 other signatories a pact which we might have to implement with billions of dollars of American taxpayers' money?

Mr. FLANDERS. That again is an interesting possibility, but for myself I feel it is less to be desired than the endeavor to carry out the support of the world's peace by improving the conditions under which the United Nations operates. To me personally it does not seem wise for this Atlas of the United States to take upon itself the task of carrying the safety of the world on its own shoulders.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield again.

Mr. JENNER. Does the Senator believe honestly that the Atlantic Pact is beneficial to the United Nations?

Mr. FLANDERS. Possibly the Senator was not present when I discussed this matter earlier.

Mr. JENNER. I am sorry, I was not.

Mr. FLANDERS. I tried to explain why I felt that it sapped the strength of the United Nations instead of strengthening it.

Mr. JENNER. Of course it does.

WHAT IS OUR OBJECTIVE—AND WHAT NATIONS SHARE IT?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. In looking over the New York Times this morning, I find several dispatches which confuse me somewhat by what I may term their contradictory reasoning with respect to the methods used by Russia when she wants to isolate or to fight a cold war with another nation, and our method of procedure, presumably for the same reason—as in the case of what has been referred to by some of the defenders of the North Atlantic Pact as our cold war with Russia. I call the Senator's attention to a New York Times dispatch from Warsaw reading as follows:

Poland has joined the eastern European economic blockade of Yugoslavia by suspending all trade deliveries. Informing the Yugoslav Ambassador of the move, the Polish

Government said today it had been taken primarily because Yugoslavia had not lived up to last year's trade obligations and was delivering nothing but nonessentials this year.

Further along—and I shall not read very much of it—the dispatch says:

An additional protocol signed with Finland seemed to indicate a close connection with the Polish decision to break with Yugoslavia. The protocol established a schedule of deliveries of coal to Finland in exchange for copper, paper, cellulose, and zinc concentrates to the value of \$13,000,000.

That indicates that all the Russian satellite nations have joined against peaceful Yugoslavia, to bring that country into line with Russia and the nations behind the iron curtain, which is the identical group we are supposed to have set up the North Atlantic Pact to bring into line, or to make our so-called cold war against them more effective.

In the same issue of the New York Times, I find on page 1 the following headline:

Acheson counsels Soviet to lift bar to western trade.

The article is to the effect, without reading the dispatch into the Record, that Secretary of State Acheson indicated that any time Soviet Russia wants to trade with America, all she has to do is to indicate friendliness in the field of trade, and that we will send her the necessary machines, tools, trucks, and materials to equip her territory, in return for such materials and supplies which we may require from her people.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, may I interrupt?

Mr. MALONE. I simply wanted to ask a question.

Mr. FLANDERS. Very well.

Mr. MALONE. What is the difference between the cold war we are supposed to be fighting with Russia and the cold war Russia is supposed to be fighting with Tito? In other words, we are said to be fighting a cold war with Russia, yet we want to be friendly and want to trade with her, sending her the necessary materials with which to hold China and Asia. They need manufactured and processed goods to equip their territories. We have lost Asia, of course; I think no one doubts that. If we send them the things they need, they will hold China, they will hold Asia as they take it over. So we have now offered to trade the necessary manufactured and processed goods in return for certain raw materials to do that. This is not the first time that the problem has been discussed. Mr. Hoffman has continually indicated that trade is necessary between the East and the West; and has indicated that trade with Russia should proceed.

What would be the Senator's idea of the most effective way of fighting a cold war; the way Russia fights it with Tito's Yugoslavia or the way we fight it with Russia?

Mr. FLANDERS. In the first place, let me say I hope, trust, and pray that the Senator from Nevada has misinterpreted the purpose and intention of the Secretary of State. If the Secretary of State in announcing willingness to trade indicated that he would be willing to send to the eastern countries either materials

or machinery useful for the production of munitions of war, he should be brought up short. I do not think he is intending to do such a thing. But there is a valid reason for exchanging, for instance, the light manufactures of Germany for the food of the Danube Valley or of eastern Germany. That is to our advantage, and I assume that is what Secretary of State Acheson was talking about.

Mr. MALONE and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield first to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to complete my questions. I call the Senator's attention, before propounding the next question, to the fact that England now has in Russia representatives engaged in an effort to extend British trade treaties along the lines of their trade agreement with Argentina, that is, by way of a bilateral treaty. At this time the representatives are in Russia negotiating an additional trade treaty with Russia. I also call the attention of the Senator from Vermont to the fact that a trade treaty had been made between England and Russia, which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the time of the debate, in March 1948, under which Russia was to receive 1,100 locomotives, together with a long list of machinery, electrical equipment, steel and other potential war supplies. I further showed, in the ECA debate in March and April of this year, that since World War II at least 88 trade treaties had been made between the 16 Marshall-plan countries and Russia and her satellite countries. Those treaties are listed in the ECA debate beginning on March 30 of this year. Certain of those trade treaties, some four or five of which were published in the RECORD at that time, list ballbearings, high-grade steel, tool steel, electrical equipment, and a long list of potential war supplies. There can be no question, therefore, as pointed out at that time (March-April, 1949), that we are arming Russia for the third world war, through the money and materials we are sending to the 16 Marshall-plan nations. I simply wanted to ask the Senator from Vermont, for whom I have the highest regard, and to whom I listened very carefully as he delivered his well-prepared and well-thought-out address, as to just where the dividing line is, and whether we are to continue to send the potential war material to the ECA nations, together with the necessary funds, to be manufactured in transit, so to speak, and thereafter to be shipped behind the iron curtain? Also, what is the technical difference between this country trading directly with Russia and trading with her indirectly through the 16 Marshall-plan nations?

Perhaps we seek by this method to ease our own conscience or to deceive the American people as to our real intentions.

Mr. FLANDERS. I may say to the Senator that I am opposed to sending Russia material or machinery of any type useful for expanding her production of munitions.

Mr. MALONE. Of course, the Senator understands that that is being done. Does he understand that?

Mr. FLANDERS. I know it has been done. Whether it is now being done I do not know; but it is a matter of concern.

Mr. MALONE. If we sign a pact which binds us to go to war when one of these countries' safety is threatened, nations which are boldly and openly sending manufactured and processed goods to Russia and her satellites which, manufactured from raw materials and by industrial plants financed largely through ECA—then what will be the result?

I should like to ask one more question, if the Senator will yield further.

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Is the Senator aware of the fact that England and France have nonaggression pacts with Russia, signed by Molotov for that nation, and, I think, by Anthony Eden for England, both pacts being entered into in 1944 in Russia, by which they pledge practically the same allegiance to Russia with reference to economic cooperation that the North Atlantic Pact provides with reference to this Nation and the nations which are signatories to the pact. The nonaggression pact between Russia and England provides in article VI, "the high contracting parties agree to render one another all possible economic assistance after the war." In article VII they pledge themselves not to "conclude any alliance and not to take part in any coalition directed against the other high contracting party." The pact between France and Russia contains identical provisions. Is the Senator aware of the existence of those pacts and that they are of 20 years' duration and contain the same provisions as the North Atlantic Pact as regards withdrawal, even to requiring the usual 12 months' notice for withdrawal at the end of the 20-year period?

The English pact was concluded on the 26th day of May 1942, and the French pact on the 10th of December 1944.

Mr. FLANDERS. I suggest to the Senator from Nevada that at some later time—and I hope it will be not much later—he raise those questions with some Senator who is more familiar with treaties and treaty making than is the Senator from Vermont. I shall be as much interested in the answers as is the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I appreciate very much the attitude of the distinguished Senator from Vermont, because these things are perturbing me. If I could interpret them so it would appear that the alliance would in carrying out our objective of a cold war or a hot war, and that there were not other directly contradictory policies being followed by other members of the pact, I could seriously consider voting for the ratification of the pact.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. First, let me say, as a foundation for my question, that I should be less than honest if I did not confess that constantly I catch myself thinking in circles on American-Russian relationships in respect to trade. The comment of the Senator from Vermont that he is opposed to shipments of any matériel of war or matériel which could be used for war-making purposes is, of course, a distinction which I can understand. But the very distinction he makes raises a perplexing problem, so far as my thinking is concerned, with reference to American-Russian trade. I hope, too, that the New York Times article quoted by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] with respect to a purported statement by the Secretary of State may prove to be not entirely accurate when we receive a statement from the Secretary of State. But I would raise this question: I am unable to follow the distinction which so many persons make between shipping matériel of war to Russia and shipping products which may not be classified as matériel of war. What about trucks? I think it is perfectly clear that within a very few months there will be a great surplus of trucks in this country. If I am correctly informed, the automobile manufacturers are already cutting back on the manufacture of trucks and are looking for foreign markets.

What about tractors? What about the overproduction of steel about which we hear in these days, which is so great that, apparently, the steel companies would welcome at least a short strike of not more than several weeks' duration if employees are sufficiently mistaken in judgment as to call a strike. There is already beginning to be an overproduction of steel, and the steel manufacturers are looking for foreign markets. It includes pattern steel for bridge construction.

Is it not true that in the age in which we live almost every conceivable commodity of utilitarian purpose can be used in the prosecution of a war, because wars are now total wars? Whether it be flour or trucks, steel or electric dynamos, almost any product we can name would be very helpful to Russia in the prosecution of a cold war. Are we not faced with the fact that we should insist upon certain definite understandings with Russia before we become a party to any trade arrangement, either directly or indirectly, through our allies, in support of which American dollars are used?

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say, first, to the Senator from Oregon that he has posed a problem with which the Department of Commerce was faced when it was charged with the responsibility for controlling exports to countries behind the iron curtain. The Department established four groups of products, one of which was absolutely forbidden at one end, and at the other end there were products which could move freely, with differing grades of controls respecting the two intermediate ones. As an example of products which would be absolutely prohibited I might mention shells. An example of products which

could move freely without control would be chewing gum and Bibles.

Mr. MORSE. Chewing gum might be very useful.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to suggest that when a caster becomes loosened on one of these chairs, a little chewing gum applied in the hole will lock the caster. I hope that remark gets into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. I imagine that in time of war chewing gum might be very helpful in certain instances. I take it it would do no good to ship Bibles to people whose ideology is one which denies the existence of a Supreme Being.

Mr. FLANDERS. It is important to save some sort of a quid pro quo for east-west commerce which, on the face of it, is to our advantage. I might mention, as an example, the possibility of German light-industry products, principally consumer goods, exported to the Danube Valley in exchange for food which the Germans cannot raise for themselves. That seems relatively harmless, but to get a quid pro quo from the Russians on any promise to be good, or something that was not definitely statable in terms of weights, sizes, number, prices, and dates, would, in my judgment, be completely impracticable and impossible.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has uttered a very profound truth. It may be true that light machinery is not directly usable in war, but the application of the light machinery, if it is needed by a potential enemy, releases, economically speaking, an amount of energy and material which then becomes free for use in making war materials. I think that is something which must be considered. I suggest that the basic problem is whether we are to have a cold war or a lukewarm war. If we are to have a lukewarm war, that is a comfortable war, and it will never end.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I myself believe that the junior Senator from Oregon and the junior Senator from Colorado have put their fingers on the nubbin of the question, namely, that anything we send to a possible enemy, regardless almost of what it is, is a war potential. It releases something else to be used, energy which may be directed toward the manufacture of war material to prepare for war, as the Senator from Colorado has suggested. I might cite locomotives, freight cars, electric cranes and supplies, ball bearings, high-grade steel, all the things being shipped directly to Russia and the countries behind the iron curtain are war materials, without question.

In another column of the New York Times, today's issue being very helpful on foreign country movements, the headline says, "Britain Suspends New Buying in the United States, Cripps Announces."



The first paragraph reads:

In a frank outline of Britain's grave financial situation, Sir Stafford Cripps announced today that the Government had ordered a halt in all new purchasing from the United States and Canada until at least mid-September in an effort to safeguard the country's diminishing gold and dollar reserves.

In view of the fact that Britain has suspended all buying from us, it seems there may be a little cold war being waged against us on their account. That is the way Russia has forced Poland to enter the cold war against Yugoslavia, namely, by ceasing to ship Yugoslavia the coal and the other supplies needed by them so very much.

At this moment English representatives are in Russia negotiating for a further bulk trade agreement. Bulk trade is even worse than individual trading with a nation, because the Government buys and sends bulk shipments and can then sell them at or below cost, or in any way they care to, especially in this case, since England is receiving enough money from us to finance the whole deal.

The article, proceeding, says that if a showing is made that it is absolutely necessary they might buy a small amount of special articles from us here. In plain words, they may under special urgent conditions use a small amount of the ECA funds for purchases in this country; this is a far cry from the representations made before this body during the passage of the initial Marshall plan.

We see here a complete round robin, 88 trade treaties made between the 16 ECA nations and Russia and the countries behind the iron curtain, sending Russia and her satellites everything from ball bearings to locomotives while ceasing all trade with us. This first move is of course only a forerunner of what is to come. Other nations will follow their lead, and we are financing the whole deal. Where do we stop? We have no objective—when we get there we do not know where we are—and when we come back we do not know where we have been.

Can the distinguished Senator from Vermont give me one good reason why we should now enter into another coalition with the same nations included in the United Nations—and which include the two major nations having already made practically the same kind of pacts with Russia, which have 14 to 16 years to run, and they can get out of it only on 12 months' notice? These are the nations which already have the bulk of the 88 trade treaties with Russia and her satellites and at this time contemplate further trade deals. England has now set the pace by stopping her trade with us. Just where, I would like to know, does the cold war start and where does it end. First, what is our objective and who is playing on our team? These questions should be answered before we again step off into space.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is a pretty long question to answer.

Mr. MALONE. It is not very long. I simply laid the foundation for the two questions contained in the last paragraph.

Mr. FLANDERS. The answer involves more definite information on the treaties and on the commercial arrangements in question than I have at my disposal, and I trust the questions will be taken up by Senators more familiar with the subject, and that the questions of the Senator from Nevada may be answered.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have previously, in the other Chamber, expressed my views about the pact we are considering, and last night, as I began to think over what I had heard on the floor of this historic Chamber, after listening to what I considered the very logical and well-thought-out remarks of those who spoke on the pact, I felt there was nothing I could add either to clear or muddle up the situation. But after listening to the remarks today, and the series of questions asked, particularly after listening to the Senator from Vermont, I felt that the very few remarks I had in mind to make this morning would more or less fit into the picture.

I remember in the early days of the airplane that I was taken on a ride by a veteran of the First World War. That airplane could rise only about a thousand feet. As I looked out over the landscape I could see very little of the surrounding territory. But a few days ago, in order to get to Washington to vote on a very important measure, I took a plane, which in the effort to escape the storms between here and Chicago, rose over 20,000 feet. I noticed that the perspective gave me a broadened view, or, to put it in another way used yesterday, I got away from the trees and I could see the forest.

What are we trying to do by this pact? Are we trying to bring about the millennium? Russia is the great conundrum of the present. Great minds in America differ about Russia. I trust that before this pact debate is finished Mr. Foster Dulles will be here to give us his impression of the issues which are involved and tell us whether or not the execution of this pact will contribute toward their solution.

I do not think any one of us today can have what has been called prescience, and can look around and tell what the imponderables of tomorrow will be in the international picture. But we, as Senators, after the President has spearheaded the foreign policy, subject almost to the directive of the last Congress—a "do-nothing" Congress—passed the Vandenberg resolution, and the President arrived at a conclusion. He arrived at a conclusion, after discussion with his advisers. The Supreme Court has said quite clearly what is the obligation of the President in respect to foreign affairs. After all, the President has the instrumentalities with which to deal with foreign affairs. He has the advice of some of the best brains in Government.

Only this morning I criticized our own Foreign Relations Committee because it had not carried out a suggestion I made several years ago, which was to divide the committee up into segments, and let the various segments of the committee concretely by visitation become acquainted with the geography and the politics of the world.

The President, as I said, has the instrumentalities. Furthermore, we gave

to the President a directive. He carried out that directive.

I said a while ago that I had been in an airplane some 20,000 feet high. I saw clear across Lake Michigan. The plane continued on toward Washington, and after flying over Washington for an hour was obliged to land by use of instruments. Perhaps instruments, accurate and nonfailing, represent the greatest symbol of which one can conceive, of what may be considered to be analogous to prescience or wisdom.

Let us see what the world picture is and what we are trying to do. Russia is a country with a population of 200,000,000 human souls. But let us not compare the people of Russia with the leadership of Russia. Five million Stalinists may believe they have absolute control over the 200,000,000 people of Russia, but, Mr. President, they do not. There are in Russia 70 or more nationalities speaking 70 or more tongues. The people of Russia are in a ferment. What will be one of the objectives of the Council under this pact?

Last fall I attended a meeting of representatives of the British Commonwealth of Nations held in Bermuda. It was a conference of British parliamentary unions, as it might be called. Representatives of the British commonwealths were there. The proceedings are now printed and not private, so I can say that we discussed the modern-day method of penetration. I asked the British what they were doing about it. I called attention to the fact that they had not hesitated to use the Indians against us. Through the centuries they were most adept at penetration. Today, on this floor, the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] spoke on the subject of psychological warfare; but in order to penetrate successfully there must be fertile ground.

Some persons rather commend our foreign policy in Europe. I cannot agree with it in all respects. But let us reverse the situation and say that we had not gone in with help, that we had not given courage and direction and guidance to the people of Europe. Let us remember that three out of every five houses in Britain were made uninhabitable by bombs during the war. Let us not forget that great numbers of people in Europe today are without guidance or direction or help; whose one thought is to find for themselves enough food to satisfy their hunger. If we had not given economic help to Europe, of what value would our Voice of America have been? Psychology cannot be broadcast with effect to a hungry people. It is necessary to nourish them so that at least they become partially rational and able to receive our broadcasts.

Mr. President, Victor Hugo said:

There is one thing stronger than armies; an idea whose time has come.

I take it that what that thinker meant by his statement was that when there is born a great idea which is backed by men with conviction and action, then the idea's time has come. A mere superficial appraisal of the idea of all for one and one for all to effectuate peace, embodied in the North Atlantic Pact, does not mean

that the idea has arrived or that it has fully blossomed in the consciousness of men.

Let us stop a moment and consider what I mean by that. Look at the map hanging on the wall of this Chamber. Notice the fringe of black appearing upon it. Think of what little Norway went through during the war. Think of what was endured by Denmark, the Netherlands, France, and England. Think of the wealth destroyed and the lives lost. Think of the economic, political, social, religious shock imposed upon those people. I ask Senators this question: If we shoot at them the idea of the North Atlantic Pact, are they immune to it or partly immune? Are they ready for it?

I ask another question: Can we fail them in this hour? What do I mean by that? If we were living in those countries, and if we had gone through the economic, political, social, and religious shock they have gone through, if we had endured the slavery which some of them had to endure under the Hun, how would we feel? We are living here in a worldly paradise. Yes, that is what it is. Most of us do not appreciate it because we were born here.

Last fall I was in San Francisco. As I came down from the Coit Tower I met an Italian. I noticed that he had a slight accent. I asked him where he was born. He pointed out over the bay and said, "Forty-four years ago I landed at that pier. But this is my country," he said. When he said that the chills went up and down my back. I was thrilled by those words coming from him: "This is my country." Why did he say that? Because he had the ability to contrast this country with the country from which he came. He had come from Italy, but he now lived in this country, and had children and grandchildren, perhaps some of them holding office, like one in my office who is the son of an immigrant. He had come from Italy. Undoubtedly he was Catholic. Since he came from that country he had seen in Italy a moral bankruptcy in religious thinking, so much so that if we had not expended our money in that country the commies would have taken over in Italy. Here he was, undoubtedly driving his own car, reading his own press, seeing that his children grow into good respectable citizens. He said, "This is my country."

Are we who live here going to sit back, after we have made a contribution, and complacently say, "This is our country. To hell with the rest of them." Who are the rest of them? There is not a Member of the Senate who does not stem from one of those countries. His forebears came from Europe. They brought their great wealth of literature and their great pioneer instinct to develop and grow and become great. We are the result.

What are we going to do? Sir Stafford Cripps says, "We have no more money with which to buy." The economic picture is going to pieces. The situation in Europe is more critical now economically than it has been since the war. So what? Are we going to help our own economic condition by ignoring the condition in Europe? Are we going to help the political picture by ignoring it? After we

have given European nations some blood transfusions, are we going to say, "Let them go to hell"? Think it over.

Something has been said today about what might be called the Russian way of playing the international poker game. We have a few aces in our hand. I would not like to see us make the mistake of discarding them.

Reference has been made to the United Nations Charter. What is said in the Charter? I cannot agree with the statement that the Atlantic Pact weakens the Charter. The Charter begins with the words:

We the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war—

We pledged ourselves to that, Mr. President—

which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind; and

To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small; and

To establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations—

Listen to this—

To establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained; and

To insure, by the acceptance of principles, and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest.

This we resolved to do. We also resolved—

To combine our efforts to accomplish these aims.

Now, because the leaders of one nation which joins with us will not play the game, we are told that we should let her leaders have their way. That is practically what has been said here today, in some respects. In other words, the 12 nations should not operate to unite their strength and work shoulder to shoulder and say to the wayward one, "We are going to pull together to see that the purposes to which you agreed are effectuated." No; it is said that we should not do that.

Let us be frank. The Atlantic Treaty comes about because at this time there seems to be no possibility effectually to consummate the great idea of the Charter among all the parties to the United Nations. It appears necessary for the 12 nations which signed the North Atlantic Treaty to effectuate a unity of purpose by creating a new organization which will provide power and means to meet the aggressive onslaught of evil.

We must recognize that there are two great forces abroad in the land. They are present in our individual lives, and they are present in every organism the human race has created. They are present in the world at large today in the form of a conflict of ideologies. We cannot simply brush the problem away by saying that there is a conflict of ideologies. There is involved a lust for power and dominion. Every one of us stems from people who at times wanted to dom-

inate. The Russian leaders are no different in that respect.

But, Mr. President, on this continent we have developed a system of checks and balances which has operated pretty well, so that absolute power cannot gravitate into the hands of a group or an individual and remain there for long. At least it cannot become autocratic so long as the system of checks and balances is maintained.

As has been said in article 1 of the North Atlantic Treaty, the parties agree to settle by peaceful means disputes among themselves. Mere words? I do not think so. I know that we have had our Kellogg-Briand Pact outlawing war. But constantly men must renew themselves by a restatement of spiritual principles and high motives.

Under article 2 of the treaty the parties agree to encourage economic collaboration. That is one of the toughest nuts we have to crack. It will require brains and vision. Why? The only money that is worth anything on this earth today is the American dollar. The other nations do not have it. We will not sell to them unless they have the dollar.

Right now in this country, as was so well expressed a few moments ago by my dear friend from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], we are becoming loaded up with goods and commodities and when that happens jobs disappear. We do not have sufficient jobs to employ all our workers. It is a vicious circle. Yet we shall be pledged, if we approve this pact, to encourage economic collaboration. That calls for the highest type of straight thinking. We must get rid of the iron curtain of prejudice and hate.

Under article 3 the parties agree that they will "separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack." It seems to me that those words are so clear-cut that they speak in no uncertain terms concerning the lust for power of the peoples from whom we stem. We agree that we will separately and jointly—under God, I hope—develop our individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

I remember that when I was in college in Michigan a psychologist said, "The trouble with man is that he does not develop his dormant faculties. He uses only about 10 percent of what he really has." Think of what would happen in the solution of our problems if we could increase that 10 percent to 20 percent. We would have the answers. We would not sit back fearful, thinking that we could not do the job. We would not say, "Let George do it." We would go to work and do it ourselves.

Under article 4 of the treaty the parties agree to consult together. "Come, now, and let us reason together."

This morning I read an article in the newspaper which related that during the operation of the airlift in Berlin it was found that a strike was in progress at a certain plant in this country. Walter Reuther and several others were invited to Washington. If the strike had continued it would have meant that there



would have been no replacements for the air lift, and the air lift would have had to stop. So they sat down and reasoned together.

Here we pledge that we will consult together. That means that those who consult for America will do so, of course, with their eyes open. They will not be sophomoric in the international poker game with those who have degrees in it, but at the same time they will understand the terrific economic situation which Europe now is meeting head-on.

In article 5 of the pact, the contracting parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of the nations in Europe or North America will be considered an attack against them all, and, consequently, they agree that if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense, will assist the party so attacked by taking forthwith, both individually and in concert with the other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force.

I heard the series of questions asked earlier today here in the Senate in regard to implementation. I agree fully with the conclusion of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I do so because article 5 provides that the contracting parties agree to assist each other in the case of armed attack. However, let us be equally frank. We are not entering into any synthetic agreement in this respect. We are entering into an international obligation based upon the realities of an international situation which everyone agrees is potentially dangerous—a powder keg in Korea, a powder keg in the Near East, a powder keg in Berlin. If an armed attack occurs, we will not fail those with whom we agree. I said as much when I addressed the Senate in March.

Article 9 of the pact establishes a council to consider matters concerning the implementation of the treaty. The council will consider. It has no authority. A council is a body which makes recommendations, a group of men, including at least one named from among our own people, to represent us in consulting with representatives of the other nations. They will consult together. If it should happen that we do not penetrate Russia, if the hand of death does not change the consuls of the Russian Empire, if conditions become more and more challenging, of course the question of implementation will be thrown into our laps. It may be thrown into our laps anyway. But at this time, under the conditions which now exist, there is no obligation upon us to vote for an implementation, because there is no attack. But let it be understood that if we ratify this treaty, we shall be making with our associates an international compact and a deal under which we mean just what the treaty says.

Article 9 of the pact requires unanimous consent for any other nation to become a party.

Article 12 provides that after 10 years any party may ask for a review of the treaty.

Article 13 provides that after the treaty has been in force 20 years, any party may cease to be a party 1 year after its notice of denunciation.

Mr. President, on March 30, 1949, in the Senate I expressed my opinion in relation to the Atlantic Pact, its meaning and its scope. My opinion was expressed largely in answer to certain interrogatories propounded by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]. I minced no words. I realize what this pact means. But I also realize what it would mean for us to be alone in the world, if conditions should become worse. I also realize that because of current events, and also because of our own ingenuity, and perhaps because of the directing hand of God Almighty, we have become the leader among nations. No nation ever was so situated before. Rome had nothing like what we have. Greece was a little nation. In comparison, the empires of the east were mere pigmies. Even Britain in her days of flower was never so situated as we are, because conditions have changed, due to invention and due to the wealth we possess. So, Mr. President, the leadership is ours. What are we to do about it? That is the question we shall answer in this particular instance.

On March 30 last, when I addressed the Senate, I expressed my own opinion of the meaning of the pact, and what I thought the scope of the pact was. Whether the pact will accomplish what it is hoped to accomplish, no one can tell; but it will be all to the good if the will and the motives of the contracting parties support it. Whether it will really accomplish what it is hoped to accomplish depends, then, upon the will and the motives of the contracting parties, not upon the letter of the pact, but upon the spirit of the contracting parties. The pact clearly declares, as I have already shown, the purposes in the minds and hearts of those who wrote it. When such a large segment of the human race agrees upon a great and noble purpose, we at least hope and pray that it a good omen of a better day. I am sure that if the great mass of the Russian people could be made aware of what is the object of the United States of America in joining with our European brothers in this new adventure in international relationships, the people of Russia would get rid of their leaders, a leadership which has caused so much worry and concern among the peoples of the earth.

Mr. President, I revert now to the council and to the suggestion I made to the leaders of all the British commonwealths, when in Bermuda, namely, that we study the question of penetration, not simply from the standpoint of psychology, but from the lessons which have been taught through the centuries, that nation after nation in meeting problems has done so head-on, by doing what was necessary to be done to solve the problem.

Mr. President, there is some evidence that even the Russian leadership is becoming aware of the significance of this pact. That is a good omen. It is not a pact of aggression; it is a pact of strength that says that aggression must not occur.

The restatement of the moral and spiritual principles in this pact, and in

the United Nations Charter, above the signatories of the 12 contracting parties is more than a scratch of the pen. The contracting parties have indicated their purpose to stand shoulder to shoulder to defend by all possible means those very concepts and principles.

Whether or not this treaty will serve to maintain international peace and security, to stop a third world war, no one knows. Only the future can tell. And the future depends upon the overt acts of the leadership of Russia. This one thing we do know, that the treaty by itself will accomplish nothing, unless there is a faithful living up to its letter and spirit. It is a solemn undertaking, but, so far as I am concerned, I am ready to say yes to it. It is complementary to the United Nations. When the United Nations cannot function because of one of its members, those who believe as it is stated in the treaty they believe, that they can bring about a great and a noble purpose and effectuate it, are not taking from the United Nations; they are supporting that structure and giving vitality to it. More than that, I trust, they are teaching the truant—meaning Russia—a lesson that she is not omnipotent, nor can Russia stand in the way of the march of peace.

While the nations who signed this international compact have differences politically, economically, culturally, and linguistically, I still say there is a fundamental basis for unity of action, namely, the hatred of war, the love of the great dynamic principles of freedom and justice, and yes, the great spiritual values. These provide a basis for unity that should make the pact. As was said by the Senator from Michigan—and I always like to hear him quote Scripture—"Without vision the people perish." I believe this pact is an indication that vision is being reborn in the hearts and minds of our people and of the leaders of the 12 nations. But vision itself is not static. It dies out or grows with the wisdom the people reach for and obtain.

Mr. President, we are writing history in this historic Chamber. It is the action of men that determines the tides in the affairs of men and of nations. It is a queer commentary to say that to Russia's leaders must be given the credit for the Atlantic Pact. It was their obstinacy, fear, incompetence, and lust for power, their lack of fulfilling Russia's obligations under the United Nations Charter, that in a large measure created the pressure that brought about the pact of the 12 nations. History here repeats itself. It was the economic and political pressures that brought about our own Constitution. It was the leadership of men like Washington and Hamilton and Franklin and Jefferson and others that interpreted these pressures in such a way that a nation was born. So, today, we have the North Atlantic Pact because the pressure from Russia created a world situation that threatened the liberty of the signers of the pact. Now it is for these signatory nations, with wisdom from on high, to carry on and make their organism a living, dynamic, working, international power.

It will not be easy, Mr. President, to demonstrate that this is an idea whose

time has come. No, it will not be easy. We know that another international crisis is developing which has a tendency to throw a monkey wrench into our foreign policy. That was brought out today by a distinguished Senator from the West, who was reading about Cripps' recent statement and telling about England's dealings. The situation is serious. Britain is moving toward insolvency, we are told. After our own activities through the World Bank, the Monetary Fund, UNRRA, the British and French loans, interim aid, and the Marshall plan, if conditions are what they are, I suppose many are asking, Where do we go from here? Let me ask, if we do not enter into this pact, where do we think we are going? What do we think is going to happen on the world scene, to little Norway, which dared take the Bear by the tail, so to speak, and the other countries which came to Washington and signed the treaty, if we let them down? Where do we think we are going? On the other hand, if we go ahead and ratify the pact, while we may not be able to stem their economic depression, at least we shall have acted like men who, seeing their brothers' needs, fail them not.

The war has been over 4 years. We are already in the second year of the Marshall plan. It would appear that many of the European governments have their backs to the wall, economically speaking. But many of them have come a long way. I have already stated why this economic situation is brought about. Many of these countries have recuperated so that they are producing more than 100 percent of what they did before the war. But the economic "filling up," so to speak, in a world of things, is creating a difficult situation, because they do not have dollars. This, in my judgment, presents more than ever a need for our putting our shoulder to the wheel and immediately ratifying the treaty. Yet we can expect that, because of the economic situation in which these nations find themselves, many of the great ideas we have been talking about will not come to fruition. Instead, states will use their power to obtain markets. There will be discrimination against our exports. But, Mr. President, the first law of life is self-preservation. People must eat, and they will take such steps as they think will enable them to obtain enough food and enough raw materials.

If this result comes about, we can expect a repercussion in this country. So, while we are thinking about the Atlantic Pact from the viewpoint of adding moral stamina and spiritual courage to our neighbors and friends across the Atlantic—and remember that moral stamina includes fearlessness—we had better do a little thinking through of the question as to what measures we should have ready to put into operation to counteract recessionary forces which seem to be about to break in our own country.

Mr. President, just a few words, and I shall close. We can make a mountain out of a molehill, in connection with this matter, or we can reduce it to molehill size. I do not think either would give the correct picture. I do not believe the signing of the pact or its ratification will bring about the millennium, as I said.

I feel, however, that it will give courage, strength, and direction to those people from whom we stem, so that they will be better able to cope with the economic and political situations.

I also feel, Mr. President, that it is not putting up a sign reading "Keep off the grass," but, to the leaders of Russia, it is setting up a red light. Russia attempted in every possible way to stalemate our action in this matter, and it will be remembered that Russia put pressure on small nations, but there was left within the leadership of those nations a new spirit which we have no right to dampen or to submerge.

Something was said today regarding England and her Navy. I am glad the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] remarked that for decade after decade England's Navy stood by us when we needed it. I feel that this is our hour not to fail civilization. Three hundred million persons who believe in the great common principles which the race has developed and inherited through generation after generation owe an obligation not only to themselves but to their children and their grandchildren to perpetuate some of the verities. I believe that this pact is one of the steps which will perpetuate some of these verities and some of these realities. At least some of us think they are realities.

So, Mr. President, I shall vote for ratification of the treaty.

Mr. DONNELL rose.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me for a moment?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the Senator from Missouri proceeds, I should like, on my own responsibility, to suggest the absence of a quorum. I have such profound respect for the Senator's dedication to the subject matter which we have under survey that, whether we find ourselves in agreement or not—and on that score I still have hope because of my profound confidence in the Senator's wisdom—I feel that the full Senate membership should be present for a report on what has been a rather unique and yet helpful policing of the operations of the Foreign Relations Committee by both the able Senator from Missouri and the able Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] who now occupies the Chair. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATKINS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brewster	Hill	Neely
Butler	Ives	Pepper
Cain	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Taylor
Connally	McFarland	Tobey
Donnell	McMahon	Vandenberg
Downey	Martin	Watkins
Green	Maybank	Wiley
Hendrickson	Millikin	
Hickenlooper	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BYRD, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is not present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. CORDON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KERR, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. REED, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. WILLIAMS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I appreciate very much indeed the very great privilege which was extended to me during consideration of the North Atlantic Treaty by being permitted to attend and participate in the questioning during the hearings held by the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate. At this time I respectfully extend my thanks to the committee for its very great courtesy in permitting me to have that privilege.

I also desire at this moment to express grateful acknowledgment of the very courteous reference made in yesterday's eloquent and powerful address by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] both to the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and myself.

As the Senator from Michigan this afternoon said, the experience of participating to some extent in the hearings and in the questioning of the witnesses on this subject has been unique; not that it establishes any special precedent, because many Senators have been permitted to have like privileges in other instances, but because of the profound importance of the subject which has been considered by this great committee of the United States Senate. To its chairman and to the other members I express, as one Member of the Senate, my appreciation of the thought and care and study which they have given to this vital problem.

Mr. President, I should like, if I may, to have the privilege of making my remarks without intervening questions, though at the conclusion of them I shall endeavor to answer such questions as may be addressed to me with respect to the subject matter before us.

Mr. President, I have arrived at the conclusion that the Senate should not advise and consent to ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty. The reasons for my conclusion are found in those certain obligations to which the United States of America would find itself in



articles 2, 3, and 5 of the treaty. I shall discuss each of those three articles.

It is to be noted at the outset that each of the obligations created by the treaty continues for a period of 20 years. Before discussing the three previously mentioned articles of the treaty I refer to Senate Resolution 239, which was considered and agreed to by the Senate on June 11, 1948. By that resolution it was resolved that the President be advised of the sense of the Senate that this Government, by constitutional process, should particularly pursue certain designated objectives within the United Nations Charter.

Yesterday the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] characterized Senate Resolution 239 as "the clear forerunner of this pact," and inquired, "If we did not have, at the time we passed that resolution, something like the pending pact in mind, what did we have?" Although the Senator made these and other references to Senate Resolution 239, he hastened frankly and appropriately yesterday to repeat what he said a year ago. Said he on yesterday:

But I hasten to repeat what I said 1 year ago. Every Senator is free to judge the sequence for himself. In good faith I said then to my colleagues that they could vote for Senate Resolution 239 without any commitment, moral or otherwise, to any particular implementation which might subsequently be submitted to their judgments. In good faith I repeat it now. I shall never ask any Senator to vote for the North Atlantic Pact because he voted for Senate Resolution 239; but I shall urge all Senators prayerfully to consider whether this sort of sequence is not the objective we then envisioned.

I digress to express at this time my admiration for the very fine frankness and courtesy of the senior Senator from Michigan, in which he has been joined by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and other Senators in making it clear that every one of us has the right to use at this time his or her best ultimate judgment, unembarrassed by the passage of Senate Resolution 239 approximately a year ago.

On June 11, 1948, the day on which the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 239, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] made the observation that—

By advising the President to go ahead the Senate in effect guarantees that a future Senate will ratify such treaties.

To that observation the senior Senator from Michigan replied:

Repeatedly I have insisted that we must be perfectly sure that when we exercise the advice function in respect to the advice to the President on this subject we are not yielding any of our subsequent consent prerogative. So far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned, he completely disagrees with any assertion that the exercise of the advice function is a surrender of the consent function.

The Senator from Michigan also made the following observation:

I hope there will be no misunderstanding about the nature of the resultant obligation. I do not think the situation remains entirely as it was before we acted. I think we have emphasized our very deep interest in exploring any regional arrangements which may

be made, from the standpoint of our own national security. I think that carries with it the implication that if we find it to be to the advantage of our national security, we shall be very definitely sympathetic with the objective. At that point we shall assess the situation from the standpoint of our own national security and make our decision accordingly.

Senator Hatch, of New Mexico, said:

I do not think there would be any moral obligation upon the Congress of the United States. It has been made as clear on the floor of the Senate as it is possible to make it. The chairman of the committee repeatedly said any arrangement must come to the Senate for approval and ratification. When it comes back, as required by the Constitution, by the debate, and by the understanding, it comes back for our consideration and final action on ratification. That involves not only the right, but the solemn moral obligation, of considering the arrangement to determine whether it is in accordance with what is best for our country.

Our distinguished former colleague, who is no longer with us, but is now on the Federal bench, said:

I want to state that so clearly that no nation in the whole world can misunderstand.

The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] said:

In the second place, I insisted that the report of the committee itself should make it abundantly clear and plain that any recommendation the President might subsequently make should be brought back to the Congress to be dealt with through the constitutional process, and that under this process we would be free to examine or reexamine the matter submitted to us for our approval or our consideration. \* \* \* I felt satisfied with the absolute assurance written into the resolution itself that the final approval with respect to any association or any regional organization, or other collective arrangement, should be for the Congress, with a definite statement in the report of the committee that we would have the reserved right to examine the association which we were asked to make. Not only that, but as I read the resolution then, and as I read it now, it does not necessarily mean that we are called upon to make a military alliance with the western European nations, or any other group of nations, outside the arrangements which we have already made in this hemisphere. The language is "association of the United States with such regional or other collective arrangement," based upon certain considerations which seem to safeguard and secure our interests.

I do not think it necessarily means that any President of the United States will, in response to this resolution, ask that the United States enter into a military alliance with western European nations or any other group of nations. It might be that we would associate ourselves with a regional organization of nations in western Europe, as we have in the recovery program. It might mean that we would associate ourselves with such organization looking to the defense of the states in that organization. We might do that by extending aid. We might do it by furnishing certain things which they would be required to have in order to accomplish that feeling of security which would enable them to make the progress which we hope they will make in the recovery program which we are undertaking to aid.

Then the senior Senator from Georgia concluded, as follows:

At the same time, Mr. President, I was unwilling, and would now be unwilling, to vote for the resolution without the explicit, defi-

nite statement, on the very face of the resolution, that it must come back to Congress for its approval and with a report which would explicitly declare that we might examine whatever was submitted to the Congress without embarrassment, and free to examine it, free to consider it.

Mr. President, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee itself, in its report to accompany Senate Resolution 239, stated:

The committee likewise agrees that the resolution should not be interpreted as a commitment on the part of the United States to extend assistance to any state or group of states. Any steps which may be taken in the future to implement the resolution will have to be considered on their merits at that time in order to determine whether such steps are consistent with the Charter and our own national security interests. Clearly any such commitments as those referred to above would call for congressional approval.

That is, at least in part, the legislative history of Senate Resolution 239, which was adopted last year by a vote of 64 to 4, as I recall. But I believe that every Member of this body is privileged to examine the measure now before us ab initio and solely upon the basis indicated in the legislative history I have just read.

I have stated that the reasons for my conclusion that the Senate should not advise and consent to the ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty are found in those certain obligations to which the United States of America would bind itself in articles 2, 3, and 5 of the treaty. I shall first discuss article 3, next article 5, and finally, article 2.

Article 3, which already today has been the subject of very considerable colloquy, inquiry, and thought by the Members of the Senate, reads as follows:

In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this treaty, the parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

I call attention to the words "continuous," meaning uninterrupted; "and effective," in other words, designed to bring about the objectives which are sought to be accomplished; and "self-help and mutual aid."

What are those objectives, Mr. President? They are the maintenance and development of the "individual and collective capacity" of the signatory nations "to resist armed attack."

This article has been considered by the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson, who, in a letter to the President of the United States dated April 7, 1949, said:

The article does not itself obligate any party to make any specific contribution to the defense capacity of any other party, at any particular time or over any given period of time. It does contain the general obligations of determined self-defense and assistance in strengthening the defense capacity of the group as a whole. The concept of "mutual aid" is that each party shall contribute such mutual aid as it reasonably can, consistent with its geographic location and resources and with due regard to the requirements of basic economic health, in the form in which it can most effectively furnish it, whether in the form of facilities, manpower, productive capacity, military equipment, or other forms.

In his testimony before the committee, the Secretary of State said:

Article 3 does not bind the United States to the proposed military-assistance program, nor, indeed, to any program. It does bind the United States to the principle of self-help and mutual aid. Within this principle each party to the pact must exercise its own honest judgment as to what it can and should do to develop and maintain its own capacity to resist and to help others. The judgment of the executive branch of this Government is that the United States can and should provide military assistance to assist the other countries in the pact to maintain their collective security. The pact does not bind the Congress to reach that same conclusion, for it does not dictate the conclusion of honest judgment. It does preclude repudiation of the principle or of the obligation of making that honest judgment. Thus, if you ratify the pact, it cannot be said that there is no obligation to help. There is an obligation to help, but the extent, the manner, and the timing is up to the honest judgment of the parties.

In his testimony before the committee, the Secretary of State also said:

Yes, Senator; I think, as I tried to sketch out this morning, under the proposed military-assistance program, we will ask the Congress to make available funds out of which certain transfers can be made, from the United States to these pact countries, of weapons.

It is also contemplated, and well worked out already, that the European countries themselves will not only do their utmost in their specific plans to supply themselves, but they will supply one another; and the exact amounts of that are also worked out, and they are very substantial. \* \* \*

We propose transfers from our own side to the Europeans, and the Europeans will make transfers between one another.

Mr. President, it should be noted from the testimony of Secretary of State Acheson, which I have just read; namely, that the European countries will supply one another and will make transfers between one another—that, in fact, the exact amounts of such transfers are already worked out, and that these amounts are “very substantial.” Apparently, therefore, the European countries believe that article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty obligates each of them to supply materials to the other European signatories to the North Atlantic Treaty. If each of the European signatories is obligated by article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty to furnish a substantial amount of material to the other European signatories to the treaty, clearly the United States of America, which has the largest productive capacity of any of the signatories to the treaty, and which, except for Canada, is located the greatest distance from the present potential enemy, would be obligated by article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty to transfer a substantial amount of materials to the European signatories to the treaty.

There appears in a document which I hold in my hand, entitled “Foreign Affairs Outlines—Building the Peace,” prepared by the Department of State, released in May 1949, at page 1, the following:

Military assistance to the North Atlantic Treaty countries and to other free nations will further the basic aims of general security in a manner which the executive branch of the Government believes will prove to be

timely, effective, and, in the long run, economical. Coupled with our membership in the North Atlantic Treaty, it will give direct assurance that the United States intends to continue the leadership which has brought confidence and new hope to democratic nations.

In brief, these things will be recommended in the military-assistance program:

That all projects of United States military aid be brought together in one program.

That a single appropriation be made to cover the costs of the entire military aid program (for the fiscal year 1950, these amounts would be about \$1,130,000,000 for the North Atlantic Pact countries and about \$320,000,000 for Greece and Turkey and certain other nations whose security is important to the United States, making a total of about \$1,450,000,000).

That the Chief Executive be given the authority to make flexible use of these funds and to meet emergencies as they arise.

That most of our aid at this time go to western Europe, an area whose importance to our security has been demonstrated in two world wars.

That the military aid program be separate and distinct from the North Atlantic Treaty but that it complement that treaty through carrying out the principles of self-help and mutual aid.

I call attention to the language of said document that it will be recommended that the military-aid program is to be separate and distinct from the North Atlantic Treaty, but that it is to complement the treaty through carrying out the principles of self help and mutual aid. The word “complement” is an interesting word. The military-aid program complements the treaty through carrying out the principles to which I have adverted. We are told in the dictionary that the word “complement” means “something that fills up or completes what any number, quantity, word, or other thing lacks of completeness; that which must be added to constitute a complete or symmetric whole, to supply a deficiency, or to make perfect.”

So, Mr. President, I think it quite significant that the Department of State, although asserting that the military-aid program shall be separate and distinct from the North Atlantic Treaty, refers not only to the fact that about \$1,130,000,000 is “for the North Atlantic Pact countries,” but that the military-aid program complements the treaty, that is to say, adds to the treaty, so as to “constitute a complete or symmetrical whole, to supply a deficiency, or to make perfect” that which is in the treaty.

Various other observations appear throughout this document to which reference might be made. I shall not go into great detail; but I call attention to the fact that, at page 4, appears this language:

Although the military assistance program and the pact were conceived of and developed separately, they are based upon the same principles and they are complementary.

Again we come back to the definition of the word “complement” to which I referred. Then, continuing, the statement says:

Article 3 of the pact provides that by self-help and mutual aid the members will develop their capacity to resist aggression. The military assistance program is based on the same principle of self-help and mutual aid. Article 3 does not obligate the United

States to provide any definite amount of military assistance or to make any specific contribution. It does, however, obligate the United States, as it obligates every other member of the North Atlantic Pact to adhere to the principle of mutual aid and to exercise its own honest judgment in contributing what it most effectively can be implement the mutual-aid principle. It is the opinion of the executive branch of this Government that the United States can best contribute to the collective capacity for defense of the North Atlantic area by providing military assistance, and it is the recommendation of the executive branch that it should do so. It is also the opinion of the executive branch that the provision of assistance will become a powerful factor for assuring success on the aims of the pact, for as the countries of the Western Union develop their power to resist aggression, they will become better able to contribute not only to the peace and security of the North Atlantic area but to the peace and security of the world.

Mr. President, I assume that those who prepared the North Atlantic Treaty desired to assure the success of its aims, and we are here told by the Department of State that “it is also the opinion of the Executive branch that the provision of assistance will become a powerful factor for assuring success on the aims of the pact.”

Mr. President, one further quotation from this particular document, at page 3, as follows:

Since the reiteration of the policy of support given in the President's inaugural address, we have associated ourselves with Canada and 10 other nations in the North Atlantic Treaty, signed on April 4, 1949. Our partnership with the nations of Western Europe in this collective security arrangement goes far to give them the confidence they need, since the treaty states clearly that an attack on one member is an attack on all members. At the present time, however, the preponderant military power which could be brought to bear upon the aggressor is centered in the United States, 3,000 miles from western Europe. It must be perfectly clear to the people of the United States that we cannot count on our friends in western Europe to resist if our strategy in the event of war is to abandon these friends to the enemy with a promise of later liberation. That strategy would be costly, since it could produce nothing better than impotent and disillusioned allies in the event of war. Plans for the common defense of the free world must provide for the security of Western Europe, but the new world may one day stand alone, an island of embattled freedom in a hostile world. Western Europe must count on us if it is to survive, and we, in turn, must count on western Europe if we are to endure. As of now, the inadequate defenses of western Europe invite military aggression, and increasing prosperity makes it a prize all the more tempting. Not until we share our strength on a common defensive front can we hope to replace this temptation with a real deterrent to war.

And then the concluding sentence:

The North Atlantic Pact is an agreement on the policy of a common defense; its very vital corollary is a program of military aid.

What is a corollary? A corollary, we are told by the dictionary, is “A proposition following so obviously from another that it requires little or no demonstration.”

So we find the Department of State telling us, in effect, that this program of military aid so obviously follows from the



North Atlantic Pact that it requires little or no demonstration.

Mr. President, we have been discussing earlier today the question as to whether the North Atlantic Treaty contains any obligation with respect to implementation. To my mind, notwithstanding the frequent mention of the fact that the North Atlantic Pact and the military program are separate and distinct, the whole tenor of this document issued by the Department of State itself and released in May of this year, notwithstanding the language to which I have referred, is that the one is a complement to the other. The one is the proposition; the other is the corollary—a corollary "following so obviously from the North Atlantic Pact that it requires little or no demonstration."

Mr. President, there was one portion of what I just read from this document to which I again invite attention, namely—

We cannot count on our friends in Western Europe to resist if our strategy in the event of war is to abandon these friends to the enemy with a promise of later liberation.

Of course, obviously, what is there envisioned is that we cannot count on the fact that those friends of ours in Europe will resist if we in the United States abandon them to the enemy, allow them to be overrun, simply with a promise of later liberation. It is worthy of note that the language which I have quoted is strikingly similar to a part of the Army Day address of Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chief of Staff, United States Army, made on April 6, 1949, which part reads as follows:

At present the balance of military power is centered in the United States 3,000 miles from the heart of Europe. It must be perfectly apparent to the people of the United States that we cannot count on friends in western Europe if our strategy in the event of war dictates that we shall abandon them to the enemy with a promise of later liberation. Yet that is the only strategy that can prevail if the military balance of power in Europe is to be counted on the wings of our bombers and deposited in reserves this side of the ocean.

Finally, as to this document which I have in my hand, at page 2 is this language:

The free countries of western Europe must be encouraged by our actions to continue their efforts toward recovery. They do not have the resources to develop adequate defense forces by their own efforts within a reasonable time. Their will to resist and their ability mutually to defend themselves must be strengthened. They must be encouraged and assisted to build up their defense forces—

Through what, Mr. President? "Through self-help and mutual aid," the same language as is used in article 3 of the pact.

Continuing with the quotation:

to a point where aggression cannot take place, either through internal disorders inspired from outside sources or under the guise of border incidents. In short, we must assist the free nations of western Europe to achieve the ability to maintain their independence and national security.

In view of the quotations which I have read, I believe it is reasonable to state

that the executive department, after exercising its honest judgment, believes that the United States would be obligated by article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty to furnish certain military assistance during the present fiscal year to the European signatories to the treaty. Consideration should then be given to the amount of military assistance which the executive department has concluded the United States should furnish the European signatories to the treaty.

In the testimony of General Bradley, Chief of Staff, United States Army, in the hearings on the North Atlantic Treaty, appears the following:

Senator DONNELL. We have heard here about the appropriation of one billion, or so many million dollars, that is going to be asked for the first year. Is that money going to be used in part to acquire from the United States Government, arms at a written-down figure, and then those arms be transported on over to Europe?

General BRADLEY. I think I know what you have reference to. I might say to start with that there is no definite list as yet; we do not have a final list of what would be of the most use to them, collectively—included in any such list there would undoubtedly be certain items of equipment which we do not need immediately upon mobilization.

It is planned, I believe, that those articles would be furnished to them out of our surplus, and that the only money necessary to be appropriated for that transfer would be that required to rehabilitate the equipment and to transport it, to put it into their hands.

Senator DONNELL. So that the appropriation then to be made would not be made to repay the Government for what is being sent over, but merely to rehabilitate, in the instances you have described, that which we already have?

General BRADLEY. Rehabilitate and transport it.

Senator DONNELL. So that in an appropriation, we will say, of \$1,000,000,000, to be used in rehabilitation, there may be actually sent equipment which has been rehabilitated by the use of the \$1,000,000,000, equipment which itself is worth many billion dollars. That is correct, is it not?

General BRADLEY. I would say the original cost of it might have been a great deal more. The present worth of it might not be anything in our own hands, but might be worth a great deal in somebody else's hands.

Senator DONNELL. I understand that. But the point I am getting at is that the mere figure in the appropriations bill does not at all, necessarily, indicate the original cost of the equipment which will be rehabilitated and sent over to Europe. I am correct in that, am I not?

General BRADLEY. That is correct, because certain items will be given to them, and the only money necessary in the way of appropriation is that necessary to rehabilitate that equipment and get it transported to the nation concerned.

Senator DONNELL. Do you have any idea, General, roughly speaking, as to what the original cost of the equipment was which will require a billion dollars to rehabilitate it?

General BRADLEY. No, sir. Because all of that billion dollars is not rehabilitation and transportation. Some of it would have to be new equipment. So that I have no idea what the original cost of that particular part would be. When the program is finally decided upon it could be figured out then, of course.

Senator DONNELL. I understood from Secretary Johnson, when he was on the stand a few days ago, that the experts are vigorously at work, and actively at work now, on preparing these figures and this detail information. Am I correct in that?

General BRADLEY. That is correct. They are working on such a list.

Mr. President, although the obligation contained in article 3 is stated in very general terms, it does commit the signatories, including the United States, "separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid," to "maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack." That article, would, if the North Atlantic Treaty is ratified, clearly commit the United States, it appears to me, to give certain aid to the signatories, separately and jointly, through the North Atlantic Treaty which would maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack. In determining the amount of aid which each signatory is entitled to ask it is of course appropriate to bear in mind the factors mentioned by Secretary Acheson in previously quoted language.

Since the United States has the largest productive capacity of any of the signatories to the treaty, and since the European countries are located closer to Russia—which is the presently most likely aggressor—it would seem clear that the United States, by article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty, if the treaty is ratified, would be obligated to contribute a substantial amount of military aid to the European signatories to the treaty.

Mr. President, the second of the three articles, which I shall discuss is article 5, which reads as follows:

The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all; and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the party or parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.

Mr. President, emphasis has been placed, in the course of this debate, upon the words appearing in this article 5, "such action as it deems necessary."

The Secretary of State has expressed himself with respect to the obligation under article 5. In the hearings at page 11, he said:

The obligation of this Government under article V would be to take promptly the action it deemed necessary to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area. That decision would, of course, be taken in accordance with our constitutional procedures. The factors which would have to be considered would be the gravity of the attack and the nature of the action which this Government considered necessary to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area. That would be the end to be achieved. Under the treaty we would be bound to make an honest judgment as to what action was necessary to attain that end and consequently to take such action. That

action might or might not include the use of armed force. If we should be confronted again with an all-out armed attack such as has twice occurred in this century and caused world wars, I do not believe that any action other than the use of armed force could be effective. The decision, however, would naturally rest where the Constitution has placed it.

At page 28 Secretary Acheson stated:

Therefore, when the attack occurs, which is an attack upon all of them by definition, each party considers what the objective under the treaty is. That objective is to restore, if it has been violated, and to maintain after it has been restored, the security of the North Atlantic area, and it pledges itself to take any sort of action, including armed force, if that is necessary in its judgment—to take whatever action its judgment says is necessary to bring about that result.

That might be a declaration of war and the use of all the resources of the country. It might be something much less, depending on what happens as a result of the attack. If the attack is something which has not been deliberately planned but has flared up in some way, it might be dealt with by means not involving the use of armed force. It might be dealt with by reason and that sort of thing.

If, however, it were a deliberate plan, a highly mobilized attack upon the whole area, then I assume that the only thing that could possibly have any effect in restoring and maintaining the security would be every possible physical effort on the part of the country. So you are not automatically at war. You take whatever action you think is necessary in the circumstances.

I quote further, from page 78 in the testimony of Secretary Acheson:

Secretary ACHESON. I said this morning, Senator, that under article 5, if there is an armed attack, then all the signatories of this treaty state that they will regard an armed attack on one as an attack on all, and forthwith they will, jointly and severally, take the action which each one of them deems necessary to restore peace and security in the North Atlantic area.

Now if there is an all-out armed attack, where the only action which this country believes can possibly restore peace and security in the North Atlantic area is the use of armed force, then this Nation is obligated to do that, but it has the decision in its own hands.

The objective which it is pledged to follow is to take whatever action it deems necessary to restore peace and security. Now if we in our honest judgment believe that action less than the use of armed force will restore peace and security, then we may do that. If in our honest judgment we believe that force is the only thing which can restore peace, then our obligation is to do that.

Senator DONNELL. If I may give you an illustration, Mr. Secretary: If Norway were to be attacked, 6 months after this treaty were ratified, by a force of 500,000 Russians, this pact would constitute, in your opinion, would it not, an absolute engagement on the part of this country to go to war?

Secretary ACHESON. My judgment would be that the only way to restore peace and security would be by the use of armed force. You might differ with me on that.

Senator DONNELL. I say, to restate my question: Your judgment is that in the hypothetical case to which I have called your attention, this treaty constitutes an absolute obligation on the part of the United States Government to go to war, does it not?

Secretary ACHESON. It imposes an obligation that if those in charge of the constitutional procedures of the United States believe as I would believe in such a circum-

stance, that force would be the only answer to that, then that is the obligation. If those in charge of our constitutional procedures do not believe that, then they use their best judgment.

I read further from the testimony of Secretary Acheson at page 79:

Senator DONNELL. I take it, Mr. Secretary, that you do not at all construe that language, "such action as it deems necessary," to give any country the right to use a dishonest determination, or an unreasonable interpretation of that language?

Secretary ACHESON. No honorable country would do that.

Senator DONNELL. What you mean there, as I understand you very frankly stated in the white paper and also in your radio speech on this subject, you said:

"Article 5 of the pact comprises a solemn obligation that each party will exercise honest and genuine judgment in determining what is necessary for the determination of peace when another party has been attacked."

Secretary ACHESON. That is correct.

Senator DONNELL. So that article 5, under the supposititious case that I presented to you, with 500,000 troops marching into Norway, we will say, from Russia, would unquestionably, in your opinion, impose an obligation on the part of this country forthwith to assist Norway by taking the action of going to war. That is correct, is it not?

Secretary ACHESON. That is the obligation which, in my judgment, would follow from the facts that you have stated. It is up to those who control the constitutional procedure to reach their own judgment. If they agreed with me, then they would feel that they were bound to do that. If they did not agree with me they would not feel so bound.

In an editorial in the New York Times, March 22, 1949, appeared the following:

The North Atlantic Pact contains promises not even dreamed of by Woodrow Wilson. President Wilson, indeed, in his war speech of April 2, 1917, looked forward to "a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free." But Mr. Wilson in time of peace would not have dared ask the Senate to commit itself, as Mr. Truman and his advisers are now doing, to go to war if any 1 of 11 or more nations is attacked. We should not quibble on this point. The defense pact means that or it means nothing.

In the Washington Post, March 23, 1949, appeared the following:

DENMARK TOLD PACT BINDS UNITED STATES TO FIGHT

COPENHAGEN, DENMARK, March 22.—Foreign Minister Gustav Rasmussen told Parliament today that under the proposed North Atlantic Treaty the United States "would go to war" if anyone of the signatory nations is attacked.

"To the Danish Government," he said, "there is no doubt that the United States will consider herself pledged to assist an attacked nation with all her force."

"If armed force is necessary to reestablish security, it is evident that the member countries possessing such force are obliged to use it. That means that if an armed attack occurred on one of the member countries it could have only one answer—the United States would go to war."

So, Mr. President, we find in article 5 of the proposed treaty, that although the language is used, "such action as it deems necessary," obviously that is not meant to permit any country to use unreasonable judgment in determining what is necessary to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area. And

under the supposititious cases which have been set forth in the testimony from which quotations have been made, obviously the Secretary of State himself, if the matter were left to his judgment, would hold that the proper procedure to take would be the use of force.

Mr. President, today the potential aggressor is Russia. The treaty continues, however, for 20 years. During that period hostilities may develop among some of the signatories themselves. Suppose such hostilities arise between France and Italy or Portugal. The United States would then be bound to consider an attack by France on either of the other two countries as an attack on the United States. We would be required forthwith to take action against France, which, incidentally, might use against us military equipment which we had furnished her pursuant to the treaty.

I have outlined the provisions of article 3, and the provisions of article 5. I come now to the final one of the three articles which I shall discuss, namely, article 2. That article is divisible into two distinct parts.

The first of those parts is the sentence by which the signatories promise to "contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations." This sounds very simple, and apparently there would be no particular objection to it; but I call attention to the fact that the parties in this article promise that they will follow three specific methods of making such contribution. The first of those three specific methods is "by strengthening their free institutions." The United States of America, if the Senate shall ratify this treaty, thus promises to strengthen its free institutions. Some change in the present position of those free institutions is obviously thereby promised, for by agreeing to strengthen those institutions, this Nation is agreeing to make them stronger than they now are. What those institutions are is not defined. There is consequently left a broad field for interpretation. The right of suffrage, the right to strike, the right of freedom of speech, employment practices, the right of freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures, and public education, are among the free institutions which it is permissible to hold to be included in the agreement which the United States of America, by this treaty, will promise, if we ratify it, to make stronger than they now are.

Mr. President, what is the United States of America? It is not the separate States. It is the Federal Government. Consequently, by this treaty, it is the Federal Government that is promising to strengthen its free institutions. It is entirely possible and the States have previously asserted sole jurisdiction over some of these free institutions. The treaty, however, which by the Constitution is declared to be, along with the Constitution and the laws of the United States, the supreme law of the land, imposes on the Federal Government, not on the States, this obligation of strengthening the free institutions.

It may hereafter be contended with much force that the assumption of that obligation by the Federal Government in



an instrument which is a part of the supreme law of the land, may constitute the creation of a power in the Federal Government over and above any power of the States in the domain of strengthening free institutions. Those who would present that contention could point with much persuasiveness to the case of *Missouri v. Holland*, 252 U. S. 416, in which case, although Congress had, prior to the ratification of a treaty on the subject matter of migratory birds, been held to be without power to enact legislation on that subject, decided that after the ratification of such a treaty Congress possessed the power which did not previously belong to it. The Court said:

If the treaty is valid there could be no dispute about the validity of the statute under article 1, section 8, as a necessary and proper means to execute the powers of the Government.

Mr. President, that a vigorous attempt to sustain on argument that this treaty creates, on the one hand, a binding and effective obligation on the part of the Federal Government and, on the other hand, an investiture of corresponding power in the Federal Government over the field of strengthening free institutions, will be made is clearly indicated by attempts already made in this very Senate to justify by provisions of the treaty known as the United Nations Charter, certain proposed Federal legislation.

Senate bill 984, introduced in the Eightieth Congress by the then junior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] for himself and others, was bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry. Subsection (c) of section 2 of that bill reads:

This act has also been enacted as a step toward fulfillment of the international treaty obligations imposed by the charter of the United Nations upon the United States as a signatory thereof to promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Obviously the subsection so quoted from Senate bill 984 seeks to base on alleged international treaty obligations imposed by the Charter of the United Nations the proposed legislation to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry.

Again, in Senate bill 1725, Eighty-first Congress, a bill to provide means of further securing and protecting the civil rights of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, introduced on April 28, 1949, by the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], the Congress is asked to declare that the succeeding provisions of the act are necessary for certain stated purposes, among which is:

To promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race or religion, in accordance with the undertaking of the United States under the United Nations Charter, and to further the national policy in that regard by securing to all persons under the jurisdiction of the United States effective recognition of cer-

tain of the rights and freedoms proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

To similar effect are the contents of a section of Senate bill 1726 introduced in the present Congress by the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] on April 28, 1949, which is a bill to provide for the protection of persons against lynching.

Again in Senate bill 1728, introduced likewise by the junior Senator from Rhode Island on April 28, 1949, a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, a similar provision occurs.

I stated earlier that in the certain sentence of article 2 by which the signatories promise to "contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations," the parties promise that they will follow three specific methods of making such contribution. One of those methods, as already indicated, is by strengthening their free institutions.

The second of the three methods is "by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded."

The ratification of the treaty, with the inclusion therein of the obligation of the Federal Government to bring about such better understanding may with force and persuasiveness be contended to vest the Federal Government with power, not previously considered to reside in it, over the education of the children and the public generally.

The third of the three methods of making the previously mentioned contribution toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations which the United States, by the treaty, promise to follow, is "by promoting conditions of stability and well-being." Here we have a general-welfare clause of unlimited boundaries, vesting, so it may be forcefully contended, in the Federal Government obligations and powers over all types of subjects, whether previously considered to be within or without Federal jurisdiction.

There can be no doubt that advocates of vast expansion of Federal powers will be alert to seize on this great repository in the North Atlantic Treaty, as they have sought to do in connection with the United Nations Charter, as an inexhaustible source of alleged Federal powers to legislate on any subject involving the "promoting of conditions of stability and well-being." It is not difficult to foresee the inclusion in many bills hereafter presented to Congress, if this treaty be ratified, of language, to quote the Ives bill, S. 984, a national act against discrimination in employment, to the effect that, "This act has also been enacted as a step toward fulfillment of the international treaty obligations imposed by the North Atlantic Treaty upon the United States as a signatory thereof, to promote conditions of stability and well-being."

The obligation contained in article 2 upon the Federal Government, to employ each of the three specific methods I have enumerated, namely, (a) strengthening its free institutions, (b)

bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and (c) promoting conditions of stability and well-being, is a new obligation which is not found in the Charter of the United Nations. True it is that among the purposes—and I emphasize the word "purposes"—of the United Nations are those set forth in article 1 of chapter I of the Charter of the United Nations; but no obligations—and I emphasize the word "obligation"—is created by the mere statement of purposes in the Charter of the United Nations. Moreover, nowhere in the Charter of the United Nations is there a statement that any of the purposes—and I emphasize the word "purposes"—again—of the United Nations are (a) the strengthening of the free institutions of the signatories to such charter, (b) the bringing about of a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, or (c) the promotion of conditions of stability and well-being.

Furthermore, the recital preceding chapter I of the Charter of the United Nations of certain determinations and resolutions of the peoples of the United Nations is a mere recital of such determinations and resolutions, and does not constitute an obligation—and I emphasize the word "obligation" again—on the part of any one of the signatories.

True it is that in setting forth certain principles in accordance with which the organization of the United Nations and its members, in pursuit of the purposes stated in article 1 of the charter shall act, the charter omits to include the obligation of performing the respective acts which are stated as purposes. However, the North Atlantic Treaty sets forth in clear and unmistakable terms, as obligations, the previously mentioned provisions of article 2.

Furthermore, article 2 of the North Atlantic Treaty does not stop with the creation of the obligation to contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations. That article proceeds further to obligate the parties signatory to "seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies."

What the meaning of that obligation is does not clearly appear. In the testimony of Ambassador W. Averell Harriman, United States special representative in Europe of the Economic Cooperative Administration, appears the following:

Senator WATKINS. I am not asking you to interpret the treaty now, as to what the intention was when they negotiated it, but what in your judgment are the economic policies which we could eliminate as between the signatories to the treaty, including ourselves. I mean by that the United States. I am speaking of conflicts.

Ambassador HARRIMAN. I do not know what that word "conflicts" relates to, specifically, and I would rather not confuse the testimony by giving a personal opinion.

Senator WATKINS. Would it include tariffs?

Ambassador HARRIMAN. I would not think tariffs were a conflict. Of course, tariffs do interfere with the freest flow of multilateral trade, but each country is entitled to decide itself as to whether its well-being is served by a tariff on this or that commodity, and what

is involved in it. We also have other agreements, as you well know, under our tariff-treaty policies, which relate to international agreements on that subject.

Senator WATKINS. Have you observed in your meeting with the foreign countries that are now part of the ECA program any conflict which you think might possibly come within the scope of that paragraph?

Ambassador HARRIMAN. Senator, I think that it is more appropriate, if I may say so, to ask the question of interpreting this article of the Secretary of State, and individual testimony on this question I do not think contributes to an understanding of the committee on what this article is intended to cover.

Senator WATKINS. I do not know myself what it is intended to cover.

#### MEANING OF ARTICLE 2

Ambassador HARRIMAN. In general it indicates economic cooperation, which, from my observation, countries are today engaged in. They are not engaged in conflict, but are trying to find ways and means by which they can help each other economically.

Senator WATKINS. Would you be willing to approve this paragraph without any more knowledge than you say you have of it, or what it means?

Ambassador HARRIMAN. If I were a member of the committee considering it, I naturally would want to understand from the Secretary of State all aspects of what it was intended to cover. I am not overly concerned about it, frankly, personally.

In the testimony of Robert A. Lovett, former Under Secretary of State, appears the following:

Senator WATKINS. Then let us come to the last sentence:

"They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them."

What specific thing did they have in mind there? Was that discussed in any way?

Mr. LOVETT. That whole sentence there, as I recall it, Senator Watkins, arose out of the efforts to make it abundantly clear that these countries who participated in the treaty would do their utmost, through the principle of cooperation economically, to improve themselves, so that they would be in a position for self-help and mutual aid. In other words, our economic program abroad as represented by the ECA was here again referred to, and they certified there was a continuing purpose of cooperation amongst them.

Senator WATKINS. I understand the affirmative side of it, but they specifically mention that they will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies. They must have had a recognition of some conflicts which they were going to seek to eliminate.

Mr. LOVETT. There were at that time, and there have been throughout, a number of instances of difficulties arising between the countries as a result either of their customs-union activities or of their financial policies. You remember specifically when France readjusted her currency the British felt very definitely it might have an unsettling effect on other currencies.

Senator WATKINS. They were to eliminate these conflicts over their currencies?

Mr. LOVETT. No; any element of their economic life. They were to try through peaceful means, which are mentioned notably in the United Nations Charter, to dispose of those difficulties.

Senator WATKINS. You will note that this not only applies to the European nations, but also applies to the United States.

Mr. President, if we follow through the further testimony of Mr. Lovett we find

an unusual inability to enlighten us on the part of this distinguished gentleman, who was authorized by the President to begin exploratory conversations in July of last year with the Ambassadors of Canada and of the parties to the Brussels Treaty, and who continued thereon as long as he occupied official position. We find a very curious inability on his part, apparently, to enlighten us as to what is meant by "conflict in their international economic policies."

To my mind, the obligation to "seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies" could be the basis on which many an argument could lie on behalf of foreign nations which might demand certain actions on our part with a view to preserving and carrying on most beneficially the policies of those foreign nations. To my mind this language could be the basis upon which those in our own midst, for that matter, who favor free trade could rest their argument. American capital and American labor might find it difficult to refute the contention that by the treaty the United States is obligated to strike down all tariff barriers, international trade agreements, and international labor agreements, and to make changes in immigration laws or monetary legislation. Such action might be contended to be obligatory on the United States under the broad and comprehensive obligation to "seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies."

The Charter of the United Nations expresses as one of its purposes—again I emphasize the word "purposes"—the achievement of "international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character," but that expression in the Charter of the United Nations of mere purposes falls far short of constituting an obligation that the parties will "seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies."

Article 2 of the treaty does not stop with creating the new obligation which I have already mentioned. It proceeds further to obligate the signatories to "encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them." Here again we find the greatest of vagueness and lack of understanding as to what is comprehended by this undertaking.

Mr. President, why should we enter into this treaty? What is the fundamental reason that is asserted, and how do the various provisions which I have undertaken to analyze this afternoon bear on that question?

In support of the proposition that it is advisable and desirable that the Senate ratify the North Atlantic Treaty, it is argued that the treaty is the best available guaranty that peace, between the nations, will be preserved.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] said, day before yesterday:

The principal benefit to the United States is the great promise this treaty holds for an enduring world peace.

The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], after referring to Senate Resolution 239 and to the fact that

the President followed the advice therein contained, said yesterday:

The pending treaty to protect the North Atlantic community is the result.

The result, in my opinion, is the greatest discouragement to war which we have yet devised.

It is urged that the ratification of the treaty will, to quote the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, "exert a tremendous deterrent in preventing armed attack."

This argument is, in effect, the same as the one which was presented by President Truman in his inaugural address in January 1949, in which he said:

If we can make it sufficiently clear, in advance, that any armed attack affecting our national security would be met with overwhelming force, the armed attack might never occur.

I call attention to the fact that the President of the United States obviously had in mind that any armed attack would immediately be met with overwhelming force. Otherwise, there would be no special reason why the armed attack might necessarily be deterred.

The senior Senator from Michigan in a notable address before the Conference of Mayors, in Washington, D. C., on March 22, 1949, presented the same thought as that presented by the President, as I see it, when he said that—

The North Atlantic Pact will tell any aggressor in 1949 that from the very moment he launches his conquest in this area he will face whatever united opposition, including that of the United States, is necessary to beat him to his knees. I reassert that this is the greatest war deterrent ever devised. No itching conquerer will lightly view such odds.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan yesterday had very much the same thing to say. In his address he said:

In my view its invincible power for peace is the awesome fact that any aggressor upon the North Atlantic community knows in advance that from the very moment he launches his conquest he will forthwith face whatever cumulative opposition these united allies in their own wisdom deem necessary to beat him to his knees and to restore peace and security.

True it is that the Senator from Michigan followed that language with the following:

It is not the military forces in being which measure the impact of this "knock-out" admonition, important though they are. It is the potential which counts, and any armed aggressor knows that he forthwith faces this potential from the moment he attacks. It is this total concept which, in my view, would give even a reincarnated Hitler pause.

It might as well be openly stated here, as it has been time after time in this debate, that the present-day fear of aggression arises from the conduct of Russia.

Secretary Acheson in his testimony said:

If I may make an understatement, the sense of insecurity prevalent in western Europe is not a figment of the imagination. It has come about through the conduct of the Soviet Union. Western European countries have seen the basic purposes and principles of the Charter cynically violated by



the conduct of the Soviet Union with the countries of eastern Europe. Their right to self-determination has been extinguished by force of threats of force. The human freedoms as the rest of the world understands them have been extinguished throughout that whole area. Economic problems have not been solved by international cooperation but have been dealt with by dictation. These same methods have been attempted in other areas—penetration by propaganda and the Communist Party, attempts to block cooperative international efforts in the economic field, wars of nerves, and in some cases thinly veiled use of force itself.

By the end of 1947 it had become abundantly clear that this Soviet pressure and penetration was being exerted progressively further to the west.

So today when we consider the North Atlantic Treaty, in the immediate present we are obviously considering Russia as the possible aggressor. As I indicated earlier this afternoon, it is easily possible that within the period of 20 years for which this treaty shall endure, during which many vast changes may take place, as has been the case in the past 20 years, there may be some other aggressor.

But what about the effect which the North Atlantic Treaty will have upon Russia? We are told today that we should ratify this treaty because it will act as a deterrent upon Russia and will prevent Russia from instituting war and attempting to wipe out the other nations which are weaker than Russia is, and that ultimately the impact of such action by Russia would come upon us.

Mr. President, of course it is entirely possible that an alliance of 12 nations may deter Russia from instituting war, and I appreciate the possibility of that fact. I appreciate that that is the point which is immediately impressing itself with such great force on the minds of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and doubtless upon the minds of many other Senators. But let me point out, very respectfully, that it is by no means certain that the effect which the North Atlantic Treaty will have upon Russia will be a deterrent effect. It is entirely possible that with the building up of military establishments in the western European countries—and I pause to say, as I have already said previously this afternoon, that obviously the State Department is of the opinion that there should be a building up of military establishments in western Europe—Russia may conclude that her own best interests demand that she not fall behind in the increase of armed strength.

I heard the rugged Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], for whom I have, as do all of us, the greatest of respect and admiration, suggest this afternoon the doubt in his mind as to whether the historic facts developed throughout the centuries past indicate that military alliances act as a deterrent to war. We are told that this treaty is not a military alliance. There are distinctions, of course, between this treaty and an alliance such as the Holy Alliance and many of the other previous military alliances.

Yet, Mr. President, to my mind, no one can read the North Atlantic Treaty—with its various provisions with respect to the maintenance and development of individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack, and containing an agreement by the parties, "separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid," to "maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack"—without realizing that it is certainly, under some contingencies, a military alliance. I do not think it is an alliance being created for the purpose of aggression. I do not believe its purpose is aggression at all. I believe that the members of the Foreign Relations Committee, the representatives of the State Department, and undoubtedly the President of the United States are animated by motives of national defense. Nevertheless, to say that this treaty is not a military alliance, to my mind is simply closing one's eyes to the clear facts.

In article 5, which I have already analyzed, the parties agree that an armed attack upon any of them shall be considered an attack upon all of them, and that each of them will forthwith, and in concert with the other parties, "take such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area."

To contend that such language does not recognize that this pact creates a military alliance is again, to my mind, clearly to overlook the clear meaning of language and the clear intent and purpose. The treaty may be intended to be a defensive alliance, and I think it is; but an alliance it is, and it is of a military nature, obviously, as I see it, according to the language I have read.

Obviously, Mr. President, there is no certainty at all as to the effect of the treaty with respect to peace. We have been told that the promotion of peace is a strong argument for going into it. If it were certain that peace would result, I take it every man in the Senate, and the lady Member, likewise, would favor the adoption of the treaty. But, Mr. President, there is an uncertainty, and as I have indicated, and as the experience to which the Senator from Vermont has referred this afternoon has indicated, military alliances have not in past years produced the war deterrent that those who formed the various alliances had in mind. As I have indicated, it is entirely possible that instead of Russia being deterred, she may conclude, as she sees the building up of military establishments in western European countries, that her own best interests demand that she do not fall behind in the increase of armed strength. As she perceives the signatories to the North Atlantic Treaty arming themselves and making military plans, as she hears that the defense committee required to be established by article 9 of the treaty has recommended measures for the implementation of articles 3 and 5 of the treaty, which is the duty of the council, as she learns of military aid being extended by the United States of America to the western European

countries, as she contemplates the construction of air bases from one end of western Europe to the other, it is entirely conceivable that Russia might conclude that she should equal or perhaps exceed the military efforts being put forth by the signatories to the treaty. Should Russia adopt the not unlikely course of progressively increasing her own armed strength, her air bases, and her other military establishments, it is not unlikely that the signatories to the treaty would on their part use every endeavor to outstrip Russia so as to be able to provide the "overwhelming force," to quote President Truman, to meet any armed attack from Russia. Russia, in turn, might reasonably be expected to add to her own military strength as rapidly as her means will permit.

Thus, seesawing back and forth, the signatories to the North Atlantic Treaty might easily discover that this document which they had signed would not only fail to be a war deterrent but would stimulate an armament race the equal of which has never been known upon the face of the earth. With increasing forces on both sides, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the western European countries, aided by the United States of America, might equip and occupy air bases which Russia would consider as involving direct danger and threat to her safety. If such should happen, it is not beyond reason to expect that Russia would advance her own air-base construction and occupy military positions of importance and strategic value with her own troops, to guard against what she might consider warlike threats or danger from the North Atlantic signatories.

Mr. President, under such circumstances there could occur, as have occurred in other instances in history, border incidents fraught with danger to the rest of the world. I assert here this afternoon that any reasoning as to the probable effect of the North Atlantic Treaty as a war deterrent is mere speculation, and that it is not unlikely that an effect precisely opposite to that which is hoped for might be produced.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a volume from a very notable work entitled "Twenty-five Years, 1892 to 1916," which refers to the conditions preceding World War I. The author of this book is Viscount Edward Grey. Just a few words about him. He entered the House of Commons as a Liberal Member in 1885. He was from 1892 to 1895 Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs in Great Britain. In 1905 he was Foreign Minister. He was Foreign Minister prior to World War I, and 2 years during that war. He retired in July 1916 due to failing eyesight. He came out of retirement for 3 months during 1919, and visited the United States, and discussed the question of peace with Germany. In August 1923 he was elected chancellor of Oxford University. He wrote a story of his life, and that is the book of which this is one of the volumes—Twenty-five Years, 1892 to 1916. I should like to read a few of his observations from this notable work. I refer first to page 279, where the distinguished

author has this to say, referring to conditions prior to World War I:

Every country had been piling up armaments and perfecting preparations for war. The object in each case had been security.

I pause at that point. That is the object of the North Atlantic Treaty—peace and security. With the eloquence and power of diction and description and illustration which Senators who have addressed us previously have possessed, we have been told that this is in effect the great deterrent to war and practically a guarantor, or as near a guarantor, as is humanly possible, of peace. And so Viscount Grey says:

The object in each case had been security. The effect—

Mr. President, let me call your attention to this—

The effect had been precisely the contrary of what was intended and desired. Instead of a sense of security there had been produced a sense of fear, which was yearly increasing. Europe was afraid of the German Army. Germans encouraged in themselves and in others the belief that the German Army was invincible; but even they were becoming apprehensive that in a few years, when the armaments of their neighbors were perfected, even Germany might be afraid. Britain was not afraid of the German Army, because she believed herself to be an island that was out of the reach of any continental army; but the great increase of the German fleet made her watchful, and she no longer felt at rest; indeed, she felt decided uneasiness at the thought of isolation.

Such was the general condition of Europe; preparations for war had produced fear, and fear predisposes to violence and catastrophe.

I take it that the gentlemen in the foreign countries to which reference is made by Viscount Grey were doubtless sincere; at least, he does not indicate anything to the contrary. "The object in each case," he said "had been security." But he then says, and so graphically that I repeat it: "The effect had been precisely the contrary of what was intended and desired."

May I read briefly one or two other observations of the Viscount? At page 283 of the same work, he says:

The lesson of European history is so plain. It is that no enduring security can be found in competing armaments and in separate alliances; there is no security for any Power unless it be a security in which its neighbors have an equal share.

Next I quote from page 53:

More than one true thing may be said about the causes of the war, but the statement that comprises most truth is that militarism and the armaments inseparable from it made war inevitable. Armaments were intended to produce a sense of security in each nation—that was the justification put forward in defense of them.

I pause there, Mr. President. Have we not heard here from the lips of a number of distinguished Senators that the building up of strength—strength which we are told by the Senator from Michigan is going to be sufficient to enable us to tell a foreign nation that she will be beaten to her knees—the building up of armament over a period of

years is going to produce security and bring about peace? So Viscount Grey says:

Armaments were intended to produce a sense of security in each nation—that was the justification put forward in defense of them. What they really did was to produce fear in everybody. Fear causes suspicion and hatred; it is hardly too much to say that, between nations, it stimulates all that is bad and depresses all that is good.

Mr. President, it is not at all improbable, it seems to me, that if we find a condition in Europe causing us to start out with a billion dollars worth of transportation and rehabilitation based on and devoted to military equipment which cost several billion dollars, and if we follow that year after year with additional sums, if we consort with those nations in the council and devise plans which we suggest to one another for implementing ourselves together in cooperative military plans, is it not likely to follow that on the Russian side, instead of the Russians saying, "Well, we had better never again declare war," that Russia will say, "We had better prepare for war; we had better prepare ourselves against these European nations and against the United States of America, rather than to cut our military defense?"

So I think there is much to what Viscount Grey says, that it would cause suspicion and hatred and would stimulate all that is bad and suppress all that is good. It indicates very clearly a possible course. I realize it is possible to take one of two courses, either the course of peace, or the contrary, but my point is that in either event the matter is one of speculation.

I have pointed out, Mr. President, the possibility that, seesawing back and forth, the signatories to the North Atlantic Treaty might easily discover that the document which they had signed would not only fail to be a war deterrent but would be an armament race the equal of which has never been seen in the history of the world.

Viscount Grey continues as follows:

One nation increases its army and makes strategic railways towards the frontiers of neighboring countries. The second nation makes counter-strategic railways and increases its army in reply. The first nation says this is very unreasonable, because its own military preparations were only precautions; the second nation says that its preparations also were only precautions, and points out, with some cogency, that the first nation began the competition; and so it goes on, till the whole continent is an armed camp covered by strategic railways.

After 1870 Germany had no reason to be afraid, but she fortified herself with armaments and the Triple Alliance in order that she might never have reason to be afraid in future. France naturally was afraid after 1870, and she made her military preparations and the dual alliance (with Russia). Britain, with a very small army and a very large empire, became first uncomfortable and then (particularly when Germany began a big fleet program) afraid of isolation. She made the Anglo-Japanese alliance, made up her quarrels with France and Russia, and entered into the Entente. Finally Germany became afraid that she would presently be afraid and struck the blow, while she believed her power to be still invincible. Heaven alone knows the whole truth about

human affairs, but I believe the above sketch to be as near to a true statement of the causes of war as an ordinary intelligence can get in a few sentences.

If it be so, it is a complete answer to those who say that if we had adopted conscription and built up a big army we should have prevented the war. We should not thereby have prevented the war; we should have precipitated it sooner.

So, Mr. President, I point out most respectfully that the North Atlantic Treaty is, after all, only a speculation, against which speculation precisely the opposite result may, on the basis of past historical experience, in fact occur.

It is argued, also, that the North Atlantic Treaty will prevent Russia from picking off western European nations one by one. Secretary Acheson, in his testimony, said, at page 13 of the hearings:

The treaty is the practical expression of the determination that an aggressor cannot divide these nations and pick them off one by one.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], in the picturesque language characteristic of him, referred, during the testimony of Secretary Acheson, to the picking-off process. The following is an interesting and brief bit of question and answer between the Senator from Texas and the Secretary of State:

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not also true that it would have a deterrent effect on the practice that is growing up of one nation reaching out and grabbing little nations one at a time, and incorporating each into its system, when it knows in advance that to do that would arouse the hostility and resistance of all the nations that are parties to this treaty?

Secretary ACHESON. Yes, sir. That is a very great part of the effectiveness of this treaty.

The CHAIRMAN. A great and powerful nation without that situation in mind could just reach out and grab some little wobbly and weak nation and incorporate it, and then go on to the next one and the next one and the next one, until it had picked the roost clean.

Secretary ACHESON. That is true, sir.

Secretary Acheson, in the testimony which I quoted from page 13, was apparently referring to a picking-off process carried out by armed attack. The Senator from Texas in his questioning of the Secretary, may have had also in mind, though, from the language, I am not certain whether he did or not, western European nations following a plan of using armed attack.

JOHN FOSTER DULLES, who, we have all heard with a great interest and very much pleasure this afternoon, is to be a Member of our body, in his testimony before the committee said:

I do not know of any responsible high official, military or civilian, in this Government or any other government, who believes that the Soviet now plans conquest by open military aggression. They have other and more efficient methods. If, for example, Soviet leadership, without using the Soviet Army, can win in China all that Japan there fought for so desperately and so futilely, why should Soviet leaders start a shooting war?

The Senator from Texas referred on yesterday to what he termed the brutal



fact that the peaceful peoples have become more and more conscious of a sinister kind of danger, indirect aggression.

Continuing, he said:

Let us not forget that no bombs were dropped by the Soviet Union on Bulgaria, Hungary, or Czechoslovakia.

Just how the North Atlantic Treaty would prevent the boring-from-within process, namely, indirect aggression not accompanied by bombs, through which, by communistic influences, Russia might seek to pick off other European nations, as, for illustration, France or Italy, does not appear. The treaty contains no agreement by which the signatories shall consider such boring from within as an attack.

The treaty contains no obligation or provision by which its signatories will join together against Russia or any other nation which may seek to obtain control of other nations by causing such latter nations to develop within themselves adequate Communist support to bring about the relationship of dominant and satellite nations.

Moreover, it is easily possible that, instead of the North Atlantic Treaty preventing the growth of communism within some of the countries, France or Italy, for illustration, under the practical operation of the treaty, some of the signatory nations may become more susceptible to communistic and Soviet influences than they are at this time. This results from the fact that many of the obligations of the treaty are vague and indeterminate, notably those provisions relating to the elimination of economic influences and economic collaboration. Because of the fact that the United States may construe its obligations not to require such economic steps as some of the other signatory countries may think the United States is required to perform, existing friendship between the United States and such other signatories may decline in ardor, and instead of amity and cordiality continuing to exist between our Nation and the other signatories, there may arise an irritation which may even mount to anger and enmity against us because of our failure, real or fancied, to perform our obligations under the vague and indeterminate provisions of the treaty.

I called attention earlier this afternoon to the vagueness of these various economic proposals, such as that the United States honestly thinks we are doing our full duty. Suppose France 5 years from now says, "You are refusing to go forward with your duty." Suppose there are conflict, anger, and irritation between the two nations. Is it not possible that Russia could step in and very shrewdly point out to the Communists, and to those whom she desired to become Communists, how much better treatment would have been afforded to the people of France by Russia than was afforded by the United States?

I have never been very much in favor of making broad general statements, like a blank check in nature. I see on the floor of the Senate at this time at least four Senators who have served as governors of their respective States, all

of them close friends of mine. They were approached from time to time to make a broad, general pledge of cooperation, something that they could just sign, and it was said it would not mean anything except that it was a matter of form indicating that they were going to cooperate and that the State administration would give full cooperation. I doubt very much whether any of these gentlemen, after their first experience, gave very much credence to the advisability of doing that sort of thing.

When we come to a treaty which contains all these broad, general things which we promise we will do, things over which there may arise the most vital, the most irritating, the most important and the most dangerous disputes over the period of years, I take it that there is very grave doubt as to whether we should depart from our traditional policy and enter into one of these general-language contracts. I dare say there is no one on the floor of the Senate who, if he went to a lawyer, would want the lawyer to write a contract between him and someone else in the broad, vague language in which this treaty is phrased.

I appreciate that no one can anticipate everything that is going to transpire in 20 years. I can appreciate the fact that it may be impossible to draw a treaty of this kind except in broad, general language. To my mind, that is one of the reasons why we should stay out of treaties of this kind, stay out of these broad, general obligations which may or may not prove possible for us to execute, and as to the execution of which there may arise the gravest of disputes between us and some others of the 11 signatories during the period of the treaty.

Twenty years is quite a long time. There is not a man on the floor of the Senate who 20 years ago did not look a little younger than he looks at this time. Twenty years ago would take us back to 1929 which, as I remember, was the beginning of a serious depression which continued with great persistence over a period of several long years. Those years seemed long, just that portion of 20 years. We have since had war. In the 20 years since 1929 many a man on the floor of the Senate has lost by death many of his closest friends. Many have seen changes in their own families. We have seen the constant procession of events in the long period of 20 years. Unanticipated events have occurred to our surprise, and perhaps to our sorrow, in many cases.

To adopt the simile of the Senator from Michigan, who said that no one need lose a moment's sleep the minute after this treaty is signed, except those who are contemplating aggression, I say to Members of the Senate, with all the earnestness within me, that whoever authorizes the ratification of this treaty, after its signature on April 4, 1949, may spend many sleepless hours in the next 20 years because of what we have done in placing our signature on the dotted line for a series of indeterminate obligations. Today, Mr. President, you and I can go home to sleep, and our country, which over a period of 150 years has, so far as I know, never been a party to any

such treaty as this, can go to sleep, and we know we are not under obligations bringing us into all the quarrels, the disputes and the relationships of 11 European nations.

It is old fashioned, I know, I realize very old fashioned, to go back even to George Washington or to John Marshall. Yet, notwithstanding all the modernism of today, notwithstanding the airplane, notwithstanding the shortness of distance today, to my mind there is something true in what John Marshall, whom we know primarily as Chief Justice of the United States, said. I quote him:

I do not think the interest and prosperity of America at all depended on the alliance with any foreign nation: Nor does the man exist who would regret more than myself the formation of such an alliance. In truth, America has, in my opinion, no motive for forming such connection and very powerful motives for avoiding them.

I call attention to the following, and this is true today:

Europe is eternally engaged in wars in which we have no interest, and with which the soundest policy forbids us to intermeddle.

We ought to avoid any compacts which may endanger our being involved in them.

By the expression I used that "this is true today," I do not mean that Europe is at this moment engaged in war, but to my mind the facts to which he referred concerning the interrelationships of Europe because of the virtual tinder box we find there, illustrate the possibility of disastrous conflicts arising in Europe.

I was in Europe in 1924, the first time I ever met my distinguished colleague, who sits here this afternoon, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. We met in London at that time. He called my attention to it, and I remember the incident. It was 25 years ago, only 5 years longer than this treaty will run. I went to a place which had been in Austria, but was then in Italy, and was known by the Italian name of Bolzano. I learned there, on the border between Austria and Italy, of the animosities, the bitter feelings, the suspicion and hatred, because of those two nations being so close to one another.

Here we are in the United States. We have been able to get along pretty well over a period of 150 or 160 years. Unquestionably we are the leading nation in strength and power. Why should we, with speculation as to whether the treaty will prove war deterrent, enter into such a contract as this?

I have referred to some of the things which might arise. Let me give one illustration, and I shall try to bring my remarks rapidly to a close. As I have indicated, this treaty is a compact between the United States of America and 11 other nations. Suppose that during the course of the 20 years' duration of the treaty some ruler or prime minister of one of our cosignatories should become obsessed with an ambition such as was possessed by Hitler or Mussolini.

I digress to say that the nation which produced Mussolini, over which he presided, is one of the parties signatory to this alleged North Atlantic Treaty, though, so far as I know, Italy does not

have any boundaries and never has had any boundaries on the Atlantic Ocean.

Suppose, as I have stated, that during the period of 20 years some ruler or prime minister in one of the 11 countries should become obsessed with ambition such as that possessed by either Hitler or Mussolini. It is not at all impossible, it is a matter of human nature, that such an official would, in his attitude toward other nations, be influenced by his realization that back of him, in the event of an attack by any one of such other nations, would be the united force of 11 other signatories. It is easily possible, while we are speculating on this matter, that his attitude might become overbearing and characterized by reckless disregard and misconduct toward other nations. Such an attitude on his part might provoke an attack by some other nation, and thereby bring immediately into operation article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, so that we individually, and in concert with other parties, would have to take forthwith such action as we deemed necessary. We were told by the Secretary of State that that means what we honestly deem necessary. We could not send just one soldier over if an actual war were started. We would have to send a reasonable number; in other words, make an honest determination.

As I have said, such an attitude on the part of an official might provoke an attack, and we then, against our own will at the time, and fully realizing the fact that he had himself provoked the attack, would become involved because of our obligations.

Mr. President, I repeat, 20 years is a long period of time, and who can be so bold here this afternoon as to guarantee that no such episode as I have speculated could arise within that period of time?

Another illustration of possible danger under the North Atlantic Treaty is that a tottering administration in some co-signatory of the North Atlantic Treaty might, in order to remain in power, deliberately provoke attack against its own country, thinking that by such attack the tottering administration could rally behind it the force of its nation and that, because 11 other nations are pledged under the North Atlantic Treaty to treat such attack as one against themselves, the country of such administration would be safe from demolition or serious damage.

Enough, however, of speculations as to possibilities. I am not here acting as a prophet this afternoon. My point is that we are asked here to take a step which, as I recall, the Senator from Michigan referred to as one of the most momentous in the 150 or 160 years of our history. We are called to take it upon the speculation, if you please, that this is going to be the greatest war deterrent that could possibly be devised. Yet it takes nobody vested with the power of prophecy to prophesy, that, notwithstanding that it may work out—and I hope it will work out as its sponsors hope it will if we shall ratify the treaty—I say it takes no power of prophecy to say here with absolute assurance this afternoon that while, on the one hand,

the cause of peace may be furthered, on the other hand it may produce precisely the result that Viscount Grey so graphically described in what I quoted.

I close with a very brief recapitulation of my view. I have stated that I have arrived at the conclusion that the Senate should not advise and consent to ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty.

I have stated that the reasons for my conclusions are found in those certain obligations to which the United States of America would bind itself in articles 2, 3, and 5 of the treaty. I took up article 3 and endeavored to demonstrate the very close connection between article 3 and the proposed military implementation program. To my mind, to say that we can carry out the provisions of article 3, to say that we can maintain and develop the individual and collective capacity of the 11 other signatories to resist armed attack without going into a military implementation program, is to violate every rule of interpretation of an agreement.

I have analyzed, as I stated, article 3. I have endeavored to show some of the points which are involved in it.

I then took up article 5 and endeavored to show, as I think is unquestionably true, that although there is the safeguard to which the distinguished Senators have referred with such emphasis by the use of the language as applied to us that we are to take "such action as it," that is to say we, "deem necessary," that means, according to the Secretary of State, such action as we reasonably deem necessary and honestly deem necessary, and that if in Norway the day after we ratify this treaty 500,000 Russian troops should cross the border, according to the opinion of Mr. Acheson—which is not binding on us, I realize, but it is his opinion, and I have confidence in his opinion in that respect—clearly it would become our obligation, under the agreement that an armed attack against Norway should be considered as an attack against us, to take steps along military lines to protect the interests of all the signatories.

Someone may say, that is what we ought to do. Maybe that is true and maybe it is not. It may be true. Yet I hold that our Nation should have the right, as the circumstances arise, to determine its course of action, rather than to tie ourselves up for 20 long years so that we cannot get out of what we tie ourselves during that lengthy period.

We are told there is a provision for review of the treaty after it has been in force for 10 years. There is nothing in that provision which entitles us to cease to be a party to the treaty. It is merely a matter of reviewing it. If any parties desire to review, they shall consult together for the purpose of reviewing, but there is no provision by which we can escape from the further 10 years of the obligation under the treaty.

I have heretofore analyzed, more extensively than I have in this very brief recapitulation, our obligations, as I see them, under article 5, and the fact that it is leading us into a situation in which we are binding ourselves for 20 long years, as the New York Times put it, to go to war in the event of any major disturbance. I say, Mr. President, that is a con-

dition in which we should not allow ourselves to be placed.

Finally, Mr. President, I went back to article 2 of the treaty and pointed out not only its vagueness, but the fact that nobody knows just what it means. Mr. Lovett does not know. No witness who appeared before us could tell us directly or indirectly whether the fears of our colleague, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], are justified on the question of whether we are going to have free trade foisted on us or something to that effect. Nobody could tell us about that. One man expressed the opinion that we are not going to have free trade and are not going to have any tariff action taken under the treaty, but nobody knows what it means.

Then I pointed out with respect to article 2 that it is perfectly clear from what has already been done in this very Senate how it will be availed of in connection with future legislation. I make no reflection on the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], of course, but with what the Senator regarded as the very best of motives he introduced bills here, the numbers of which I have given, based in part on the theory that they are carrying out obligations of the United Nations Charter, when no obligation is created by the United Nations Charter, as I have indicated. But, as I have demonstrated, I think the North Atlantic Treaty, instead of merely setting forth purposes, makes a binding contract which I undertake to say will be availed of by many a legislator in presenting bills to this body and to the House of Representatives, which would be based on the theory that the Federal Government as against the State governments has been vested with certain powers under the terms of this treaty, just as it is asserted, in substance, in the various bills to which I have referred, that the Federal Government is vested with such powers under the United Nations Charter.

Mr. President, I very greatly appreciate the courtesy of the Members of the Senate in listening to me at this length this afternoon. I feel very strongly upon this question. I think we have before us a duty of tremendous consequence. I for one want to go on record again here and now, after what I trust has been a reasonably thorough study of the question—at least I think a conscientious study of it—and I do go on record as being opposed to ratification of the North Atlantic Treaty.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make one or two inquiries about the pending treaty. I am attempting to ascertain, if I can, how many Senators expect to speak tomorrow, either for the treaty or in opposition.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I may state to the distinguished majority leader that I know of three speeches which are to be made. I cannot say that they will all be made tomorrow. I am quite sure that two of them will be made tomorrow on this side of the aisle. I do not know how long they will take. Two or three Senators



have spoken to me, wondering whether the majority leader plans that the Senate shall take a recess from Friday until Monday, or whether they should attempt to prepare their speeches and get ready for a session on Saturday. I think if the majority leader could give us that information it would be very helpful to Senators who are now preparing to speak.

Mr. LINGER. Mr. President, I wish to speak in opposition to the treaty. I should like to speak on Monday, if that is agreeable.

Mr. LUCAS. It is agreeable to me for the Senator from North Dakota to speak whenever he desires. The only thing I am attempting to do is to inform myself so that I can tell Senators about the program for the week end.

I can say now that it is not planned to have a session of the Senate on Saturday. However, I was hoping that we might continue in session tomorrow a little later than usual. My hope is, in view of the speed with which we are moving in the debate on the North Atlantic Treaty, that there may be a possibility of finishing it on Monday. Perhaps after tomorrow we may look toward a unanimous consent agreement, depending upon how we get along.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I will say to the majority leader that I will be most cooperative in his desires. Now that he has made the announcement that there will be no Saturday session, I feel that very definitely there will be some speeches on Monday. Whether or not we can reach an agreement on Monday setting a time for a vote, I do not know. We can try. I am satisfied that there will be at least two speeches tomorrow, one of which will be quite at length.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the information given by the Senator from Nebraska. A number of important bills are on the calendar, and others will be reported by various committees. I am not attempting to force Senators to speed the pact along, because I realize its great importance. On the other hand, it appears from conversations that we might be able to finish the pact on Monday.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not mean to indicate that there was a possibility of a vote on Monday. My statement was that I thought we might look hopefully toward getting a unanimous-consent agreement on Monday, possibly for a vote on Tuesday or Wednesday. I am satisfied that three or four Senators whom the Senate would like to hear would appreciate it if we could continue on Monday, and attempt to get a unanimous-consent agreement at that time. I cannot assure the distinguished majority leader that it can be done even at that time; but I will say to him that I shall cooperate with him to the best of my ability.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure the Senator will do that. All I am attempting to do at this time is to lay a foundation for the hope that we may be able, either

tomorrow or Monday, to get a unanimous-consent agreement for a vote at a definite time. If we could do that, it would be much more satisfactory to Senators, who would then know the exact hour at which the vote upon ratification of the treaty would be had.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another inquiry?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Now that the distinguished majority leader has discussed the program with respect to the pact, I wonder if he can indicate at this time what will be the next legislation to be taken up at the conclusion of consideration of the pact?

Mr. LUCAS. As I recall, at one of the Policy Committee meetings it was agreed that we would probably take up the reciprocal trade agreements program, although I must confess to my able friend that there is considerable interest in the Senate taking up the minimum-wage bill, in view of the fact that it was unanimously reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. As I understand, that bill does not seek additional coverage, but merely increases the wage per hour from what it is now to 75 cents. The bill having had the unanimously favorable report of the committee, it was thought by Members on both sides of the aisle with whom I have talked that perhaps we could dispose of it in a short time.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the majority leader for making that statement, because it indicates what may be taken up when we shall have concluded consideration of the pact.

Mr. LUCAS. I can assure the Senator from Nebraska that we shall have something to do.

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE IN DISTRICT COURT FOR TERRITORY OF ALASKA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PEPPER in the chair) as in legislative session, laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 70) to make effective in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska rules promulgated by the Supreme Court of the United States governing pleading, practice, and procedure in the district courts of the United States, which was, on page 2, after line 7, to insert:

SEC. 2. The Supreme Court shall have the power to prescribe, by general rules, the forms of process, writs, pleadings, and motions, and the practice and procedure of the district courts of the United States and of the District Court for the Territory of Alaska in civil actions.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

#### PAYMENT OF FEES, EXPENSES, AND COSTS OF JURORS

The PRESIDING OFFICER, as in legislative session, laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1042) relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of jurors, which was, to strike out line 22, on page 2, down to and including line 2, on page 3.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I inquire what the amendment is?

Mr. McCARRAN. The House amendment makes certain revision as to the fees for jurors, as the bill was passed by the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has moved that the Senate concur in the House amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

#### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The PRESIDING OFFICER, as in legislative session, laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, which were, on page 2, to strike out line 11, and on page 9, to strike out line 13.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. As the Senator will recall, the Senate has been passing a number of concurrent resolutions dealing with suspension of certain deportations. In this case the House adopted the Senate bill with certain eliminations.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 20. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1947, as amended, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics;

H. R. 52. An act for the relief of Nevada County, Calif.;

H. R. 596. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of John E. Parker, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States;

H. R. 682. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Elliott Hewitt;

H. R. 703. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Oteel Foxworth;

H. R. 709. An act for the relief of the General Engineering & Dry Dock Corp.

H. R. 709. An act for the relief of the General Bank, a California corporation, as assignee of John C. Williams, an individual operating under the fictitious name and trade style of Central Machine Works, of Oakland, Calif.;

H. R. 1042. An act for the relief of Hoy C. Wong;

H. R. 1116. An act for the relief of Mexican Fibre & Twine Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1131. An act for the relief of James Fred Girdley and Percy Bridgewater;

H. R. 1173. An act for the relief of Florence Bryant Peters and E. B. Peters;

H. R. 1297. An act for the relief of Alvin G. Patton;

H. R. 1470. An act for the relief of the estate of James F. Delahanty, deceased;

H. R. 1496. An act for the relief of Mrs. Thelma Lee Rynaard;

H. R. 1676. An act for the relief of Thomas M. Bates;

H. R. 2349. An act for the relief of Col. Włodzimierz Onacewicz;

H. R. 2785. An act to provide for further contributions to the International Children's Emergency Fund;

H. R. 2848. An act for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov;

H. R. 3017. An act for the relief of Ramon G. Hunter and Arthur Nancett;

H. R. 3077. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Levy;

H. R. 3151. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of any kind of aureomycin, chloramphenicol, and bacitracin, or any derivative thereof;

H. R. 3313. An act for the relief of the estate of the late Manuel Graulau Velez;

H. R. 3320. An act for the relief of Ignacio Colon Cruz;

H. R. 3321. An act for the relief of Gloria Esther Diaz, Lydia Velez, and Gladys Prieto;

H. R. 3323. An act for the relief of the estate of Rafael Rebollo;

H. R. 3680. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim five and one-tenth acres of land in Washington County, Miss., to the Mississippi State College;

H. R. 3717. An act to repeal the act of July 24, 1946, relating to the Swan Island Animal Quarantine Station;

H. R. 3720. An act for the relief of Erwin F. Earl;

H. R. 3812. An act for the relief of Myrtle Ruth Osborne, Marion Walts, and Jessie A. Walts;

H. R. 4252. An act to transfer the trawlers *Alaska* and *Oregon* from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Fish and Wildlife Service;

H. R. 4373. An act for the relief of Ray G. Schneyer and Dorothy J. Schneyer;

H. R. 4559. An act for the relief of Louis Brown;

H. R. 4807. An act for the relief of Robert A. Atlas; and

H. J. Res. 228. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for the work of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week.

#### THE SITUATION IN HAWAII

As in legislative session.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as in legislative session, on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], my colleague the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the President of the United States, under certain conditions, to appoint boards of inquiry with power to make binding recommendations with respect to labor disputes in trade between the continental United States and the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2216) to authorize the President of

the United States, under certain conditions, to appoint boards of inquiry with power to make binding recommendations with respect to labor disputes in trade between the continental United States and the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, this is a brief bill, and I should like to read it into the Record at this time:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That, whenever the President of the United States shall find that there is, or will be, an interruption in ocean transportation service of passengers or freight between the continental United States and the Territory of Hawaii, or in the unloading or loading of freight in such transportation service, because of an actual or threatened strike or work stoppage or for any other reason, if permitted to occur or to continue, imperil the health, safety, or welfare of Hawaii, he is authorized to appoint a Board of Inquiry to hear and determine the facts of the dispute and based upon their findings to make recommendations to him for the settlement of the dispute on its merits. The President may call upon the parties of the dispute to accept as final and binding upon them the recommendations of the Board of Inquiry unless the parties to the dispute reach a collective bargaining agreement amicably settling the dispute.

Sec. 2. Boards of Inquiry established herein to be provided with the usual powers with respect to emergency boards under the Railway Labor Act as to personnel, subpoena power and right to sit any place in the United States or the Territory of Hawaii, and with such secretarial and clerical services as are necessary to be furnished by the Department of Labor or the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

Sec. 3. Findings and recommendations of the Board are subject to review by the appropriate Federal Court of Appeals.

Sec. 4. The President may delegate to the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii any right, power, or duty imposed on or exercisable by him under this act. The Governor of the Territory of Hawaii exercising any rights or powers hereunder shall make a full and complete report to the President of any action taken by him in pursuance thereof.

Sec. 5. This act shall expire 180 days from the effective date hereof.

Mr. President, the serious situation in the Hawaiian Islands has continued since the first day of May. There are approximately 540,000 American citizens residents of the islands in the Hawaiian group. The normal working force is more than 180,000. Unemployment at the present time is more than 20,000. It is increasing at the rate of 1,000 a week. There is now permitted only one relief ship every 3 weeks, containing food and medical supplies. The normal requirements of the islands exceeded three ships a week, for the normal supplies of all types needed to support the economy of the islands.

Delegate FARRINGTON has introduced a number of bills, and I understand that he is introducing a bill similar to this in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I do not believe that any person or any group of persons should have the right to strangle an American community of 540,000 people, or any other number. Small-business men in the islands are suffering greatly as a result of this strike. Their stocks

are becoming depleted. White-collar workers, as well as other workers in the islands, are being laid off because there is not sufficient business, because of the embargo which has been in effect for almost 2½ months. The power to strangle the life of an American community is more power than any responsible man or group of men should want, and it is far more power than any irresponsible man or group of men should be allowed to have.

At his press conference today the President of the United States indicated that although he still felt he had certain inherent powers to deal with national emergencies, yet, as he is reported as stating, if he is correctly quoted, he believes the Hawaiian situation does not constitute a national emergency, as he interprets it. In other words, his concept apparently was that it had to be something that affected, if not all 48 of the States, at least a substantial number of them. When some of the reporters asked the President whether, if a bill on that subject were introduced, he would approve it, apparently the reply was that he was not seeking any additional powers to deal with this problem.

Mr. President, someone must take some responsibility in this regard. This island is being left an orphan out in the Pacific. It is an important bastion of American defense. For a long period of years the people of Hawaii have demonstrated their loyalty as a Territory and as a group who hope that some day they may become a State in the Union. Certainly if the President of the United States does not feel that under existing authority he has power to help meet this problem, then the Congress of the United States has an obligation to give him whatever authority is needed.

I do not claim, on behalf of those who are sponsoring this bill, that it is a perfect solution. I do not say it is a utopian bill. I do not say the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare cannot improve it, or that if it comes to the floor of the Senate it cannot be improved there. But I do say that the time has passed when these people should be left to themselves, as orphans out in the Pacific, with their economy being strangled, with hardship being brought upon a greater number of innocent men, women, and children, upon business and labor alike. It is high time that the Congress of the United States took affirmative action to help relieve that situation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] for his statesmanship in introducing this bill. His act in this instance is characteristic of his record in the Senate of the United States.

I can say what he might not say, Mr. President, in regard to one item of background in connection with this bill, namely, that the bill is not going to be pleasing either to labor or to management. But I wish to join the Senator from California in pointing out, not only to the Congress of the United States, but to the people of this country, that the time has come when the economic war that is going on in the Hawaiian Islands must stop, from the standpoint of the



human values that are involved, from the standpoint of the people who are suffering as a result of the deadlock which has developed between a powerful union and a powerful employer group.

Mr. President, let me say a word about the criticism which we shall hear about this bill. There will be those who will say, as some telegrams I have already received indicate, that this bill amounts, in fact, to forcing these parties into arbitration. I wish to say that in my judgment the union cannot morally justify a continuation of the strike, with its tremendous costs in terms of the human suffering it is causing; and, likewise, the management in Hawaii cannot justify carrying on this economic attack against the union. It is perfectly obvious to me, Mr. President, that a rule of common sense ought to be applied in that economic war.

What is that rule? It is a submission of the evidence by both sides in support of their respective contentions as to the merits of their positions in that economic struggle. That is the only common-sense way to settle that dispute.

I think the President of the United States has a great obligation to perform in bringing to bear the prestige of his great office upon the parties to that dispute, by asking them to accept a board of arbitration, which this bill authorizes the President to appoint—and we call it a board of inquiry—and submit their case, on its merits, to that board, with the understanding, of course—which I think is clearly implied in the bill—that when the President calls upon them to accept the appointment of a board of inquiry and when it is appointed, work will then proceed, on the part of the longshoremen and the employers, to bring relief to the thousands of citizens in Hawaii who now are suffering great hardships as a result of that economic contest between the employers and the union.

Mr. President, I speak with some experience insofar as concerns the arbitration of maritime disputes involving this very union and involving some of the shipping companies that are involved in this particular struggle. I cannot say with statistical accuracy how many cases involving these parties I have handled, but it is at least two score or more, Mr. President. I wish to say that I am inclined to believe that when the record is made, it will be found that each side, as to some matters, is taking a rather unreasonable position. But let the record speak for itself. The appointment of a group of impartial arbitrators will turn this situation from economic war into a judicial process for the settlement of the dispute; and any party that cannot by a preponderance of the evidence establish the merits of its contentions on a particular issue ought to lose, and I know whereof I speak. If the arbitrators function as private judges, which is the only capacity in which the arbitrators should function, then the record itself will write the decision. I say that rule of reason and that rule of common sense is the rule which should be applied in the Hawaiian dispute; and let us do away with the unreasonable attitude on the part of both parties to the dispute.

Now a word about certain fringe issues, Mr. President, if I may describe them as such, that are involved in this dispute. The employers and great forces in this country that are supporting the employers take the position that what they are confronted with is the leftist political philosophy of one Harry Bridges. I think I have made it clear before—but if I have not, let me try to make it clear now—that I want this RECORD to show that I do not share in any respect the political philosophy of Harry Bridges, because in my opinion Harry Bridges is a leftist; and I have already, in times gone by, defined on the floor of the Senate what I mean by "leftist." There is no liberalism in any leftist, Mr. President, because a leftist fundamentally and ultimately believes in a state economy; and I am satisfied, from his record, from his public pronouncements, that Harry Bridges believes in a state economy. I will have none of it, Mr. President.

But I refuse to let the employers or any group in this country lead us astray as to the issue in the Hawaiian dispute. The issue is not the leadership of that union. The issue is not the political philosophy of Harry Bridges. The issue involves the union's demands for changes in hours, wages, and working conditions. There is no way of getting away from that fact, Mr. President. That is the issue. I have handled arbitration cases where large parts of the west coast have been tied up without a ship moving. The charge in those cases was that the issue was the political philosophy of Harry Bridges. But as the private judge of the parties in those cases—and the record is a written record, and a very clear one—I said, "Let this record present the evidence in respect to the claims of the parties concerning their contentions over hours, wages, and conditions of employment. That is what is before this arbitrator, and I want to say that the attacks upon the union are of no concern to this arbitrator, because this union still has the right under American law to try to obtain in accordance with that law an improvement in the wages and the hours and the working conditions of the members of the union, if it can demonstrate by the evidence that they are entitled to changes in hours, wages, and conditions of employment."

Likewise, in other cases, Mr. President, I have made very clear to Mr. Harry Bridges that his dislike for certain employers in the West Coast Waterfront Employers Association, or for certain policies of those employers that had no bearing whatever upon the collective-bargaining agreement which was before me for interpretation or adjudication, was not going to be made an issue before me in my arbitration courtroom. That is my answer today to those who would try to turn the Hawaiian dispute into an issue either over the leftist policies of Harry Bridges or over the economic policies of the Big Five in Hawaii, separate and distinct from the problem of hours, wages, and conditions of employment involved in this dispute. I would say to the American people and to the people of Hawaii today, let us not lose sight of the fundamental issue that is involved in

this dispute, because if we do lose sight of it, then we are going to be guilty of permitting fringe issues, matters that have no connection with the fundamental dispute itself, to prejudice us and bias our judgment in connection with the solution to this problem.

There are those that are saying that the bill which the distinguished Senator from California has just introduced amounts to compulsory arbitration. It does not. It does not, because it leaves it up to the discretion of the President to call upon the parties after an adjudication on the merits has been held, to accept the recommendations of that arbitration tribunal unless they can amicably settle their differences by collective bargaining. I should be less than honest if I did not point out that in my judgment it is to be expected that after a fair hearing on the record has been held, a request from the President of the United States that the parties bring to an end the suffering caused by the dispute by accepting the decision of his board of inquiry, will necessarily bring great psychological pressure to bear upon the parties to the dispute. I think that should be. I think we should seek that end, so that public opinion can then determine who is in the wrong if either party, after such a fair decision has been rendered, seeks to defy the President of the United States and thereby the Government of the United States. We can then take such steps as we may deem appropriate to end the suffering now existing in Hawaii.

As I have said on other occasions when I have been in the position, as a member of the War Labor Board, that has necessitated handing down a decision against either a defiant employer or a defiant union, if the time ever comes that either an employer or a union in this country believes that its selfish interests should be placed above the welfare of thousands upon thousands of American people, when a fair opportunity for a settlement of their dispute on the merits of the record has been given to them, then I can be counted among those who will always say, "I am for using all the forces at the command of our Government to bring to an end the cause of such suffering."

I say to the shipowners this afternoon and I say to Harry Bridges that if the President of the United States follows the fair procedure set out in the proposal of the Senator from California, and either one of them, after a fair hearing on the merits, takes the position of permitting selfish interests to be placed above the welfare of the thousands of people of Hawaii, the junior Senator from Oregon can then be counted as one who will support at that time using every force of government to bring to justice whichever side it is that believes it has any right to continue to cause the great suffering that is going on in Hawaii today.

And may I say in closing, Mr. President, that this bill has a great advantage in that it provides what I have said so many times is necessary in the handling of labor disputes, an opportunity for each side to save face. That is what

is needed. It gives each side an opportunity to present its case on the merits; then, after the decision, but with work continuing, negotiate through good faith collective bargaining any modification of the decision on which they can agree, thus retaining this principle of voluntarism for which the junior Senator from Oregon has always pleaded in connection with proposed labor legislation. I want to keep as the major premise for the settlement of labor disputes in this country the principle of free collective bargaining, constantly being made available to the parties, but with work continuing. Let there be no doubt, may I say to the parties, in respect to the bill which the Senator from California has introduced, that it is my intention that, if the President follows the course of action which is made available to him under the bill, it should be with the understanding that the workers return to work immediately, and that the operators in turn proceed to operate their ships as they did prior to the dispute. Never would I sit as an arbitrator on the west coast, Mr. President, with a strike gun or a lock-out gun at my head. A judicial process in the settlement of a labor dispute on the merits of the case cannot be carried on with men engaged in a strike. Thus, I had the rule of procedure, "We work first and arbitrate afterwards." On several occasions, Mr. President, in the years I served as the arbitrator for this great industry, I would be sitting in San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Pedro, Seattle, Tacoma, or Port Angeles, conducting an arbitration hearing, and the report would come to me that a strike had occurred some place on the west coast. We immediately stopped the hearing, because my rule was that the judicial process could not proceed in the face of a stoppage.

I always laid down my rule of procedure that we would not make a mockery of the judicial process in the arbitration courtroom. So I say to the President of the United States that I think the bill offered by the Senator from California this afternoon gives him a great opportunity for statesmanship again, to call upon the parties to arbitrate the case before a Presidential board of inquiry, with the understanding, however, that he should make it perfectly clear to the parties that before the arbitration proceeds the employees proceed to work the ships and bring the needed relief for the great suffering which is now going on in the Hawaiian Islands.

I hope, Mr. President, that this brief explanation of my position in regard to the matter will at least be helpful in clarifying what I think is the obvious procedure implied and inherent in this bill which the statesmanship of the Senator from California has caused him to introduce.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to thank the able Senator from Oregon for his remarks. I think he has very clearly stated the issue before the country and the people of the Hawaiian Islands. I think the Senator from Oregon has made it very clear that if, after the process has been established by the power and prestige of the great office of the President of the United States, there

is a defiance of law and order and of constituted authority, neither the Congress nor the President of the United States can sit back idly and permit the entire economy of 540,000 Americans in an island possession to grind to a stop and work a great hardship in an area which is part and parcel of the United States of America. I say, Mr. President, that if there is any defiance of the Government of the United States in attempting in a fair and equitable way to bring this difficulty to a halt, I personally, speaking only for myself, believe that the Federal Government should be no less concerned with seeing that the economy of the Hawaiian Islands continues than it has been in seeing that the economy of Berlin continued; and if, ultimately—and I hope it does not come to that—the only way by which 540,000 Americans can be kept from getting into a condition of economic chaos is by establishing a Hawaiian airlift, then, Mr. President, the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States may even have to consider that along with any other steps which may be necessary.

#### RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, July 8, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate July 7 (legislative day of June 2), 1949:

Edward B. Lawson, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iceland.

#### WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate July 7 (legislative day of June 2), 1949:

POSTMASTER  
NEW YORK

Walter E. Pinski, Holland.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 7, 1949

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Acting Chaplain, Rev. Jacob S. Payton, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we bow in grateful acknowledgment of remembered mercies. Thanks be unto Thee for this favored land with mountains stored with treasure and valleys rich with the promise of ripening harvests. Because we have read that "a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth," guard us from making a false appraisal of the wealth of America.

Aid these Thy servants in their efforts to make the land they love and serve abound in added opportunities for the

production of character which ever must rate chief among our national resources. Keep us mindful that America can be improved only as each citizen improves himself spiritually by serving Thee and by keeping Thy commandments.

Grant, O Lord, that through Members of this body truth and righteousness may be made manifest this day. We offer our prayer in the name of Jesus our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 20. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1947, as amended, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics;

H. R. 52. An act for the relief of Nevada County, Calif.;

H. R. 596. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of John E. Parker, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States;

H. R. 682. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Elliott Hewitt;

H. R. 703. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Oteen Foxworth;

H. R. 709. An act for the relief of the General Engineering & Dry Dock Corp.;

H. R. 1009. An act for the relief of the Central Bank, a California corporation, as assignee of John C. Williams, an individual operating under the fictitious name and trade style of Central Machine Works, of Oakland, Calif.;

H. R. 1042. An act for the relief of Hoy C. Wong;

H. R. 1116. An act for the relief of Mexican Fibre & Twine Co., Inc.;

H. R. 1131. An act for the relief of James Fred Girdley and Percy Bridgewater;

H. R. 1173. An act for the relief of Florence Bryant Peters and E. B. Peters;

H. R. 1297. An act for the relief of Alvin G. Patton;

H. R. 1470. An act for the relief of the estate of James F. Delahanty, deceased;

H. R. 1496. An act for the relief of Mrs. Thelma Lee Rynaard;

H. R. 1676. An act for the relief of Thomas M. Bates;

H. R. 2349. An act for the relief of Col. Wlodzimierz Onacewicz;

H. R. 2848. An act for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov;

H. R. 3017. An act for the relief of Ramon G. Hunter and Arthur Nancett;

H. R. 3077. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rebecca Levy;

H. R. 3151. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, by providing for the certification of batches of drugs composed wholly or partly of any kind of aureomycin, chloramphenicol, and bacitracin, or any derivative thereof;

H. R. 3313. An act for the relief of the estate of the late Manuel Graulau Velez;

H. R. 3320. An act for the relief of Ignacio Colón Cruz;

H. R. 3321. An act for the relief of Gloria Esther Diaz, Lydia Velez, and Gladys Prieto;

H. R. 3323. An act for the relief of the estate of Rafael Rebollo;